

12-4

LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Case.

BT 265 .M333 1825 v.2 c.2

S. Magee, William, 1766-1831.

B Discourses and dissertations
on the scriptural doctrines

Copy 2

Presented to the Theo. Seminary
at Princeton, New Jersey,
by the Female Society of
Downtown, New York,
for the particular use of
students under the patron-
age of that Society, and the
Presbytery of New York.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the above mentioned matter. I am sorry to hear that you are not satisfied with the result of the investigation. I am, however, unable to do more than to state the facts as they appear to me. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
 Yours, &c.
 J. M. Smith





DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS

ON THE

Scriptural Doctrines

OF

ATONEMENT & SACRIFICE;

AND

ON THE PRINCIPAL ARGUMENTS ADVANCED, AND THE MODE
OF REASONING EMPLOYED, BY THE OPPONENTS
OF THOSE DOCTRINES AS HELD BY
THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH :

WITH

AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

SOME STRICTURES ON MR. BELSHAM'S ACCOUNT

OF THE

UNITARIAN SCHEME,

IN HIS REVIEW OF MR. WILBERFORCE'S TREATISE :

TOGETHER WITH

REMARKS ON THE VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

LATELY PUBLISHED BY THE UNITARIANS.

BY WILLIAM MAGEE, D.D.F.R.S.M.R.I.A

DEAN OF CORK, CHAPLAIN TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE LORD LIEUTENANT OF
IRELAND, LATE S.F.T.C. AND PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS IN
THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

FROM THE LAST LONDON EDITION, WITH LARGE ADDITIONS.

VOL. II.

PHILADELPHIA:

S. POTTER & CO. No. 115, CHESNUT STREET.

JESPER HARDING, PRINTER.

1825

DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS
ON THE
Scriptural Doctrines
OF
ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE.

NO. LX.—ON GROTIUS' STRANGE MISCONCEPTION OF THE
NATURE OF ABEL'S SACRIFICE.

PAGE 39. (*o*)—Grotius, followed by Le Clerc, interprets the words in Gen. iv. 4. which we translate *the firstlings*, as signifying the *best*, and *finest*; and will have this to relate only to the *wool*, which is known to have been offered to the Gods in later times. That also, which we render *the fat thereof*, he considers to mean no more than the *milk*, and appeals to the Seventy, who in numerous instances have certainly translated the word חֵלֶב, here used, by γαλα.

But first, as to בְּכוֹרִים, it cannot be denied, that, in relation to *man* or *beast*, it is never found in any part of the bible, in any other sense than that of *first-born*. So appropriate is this meaning, that בְּכוֹר is used *absolutely*, to express *primogeniture*, and the *right* resulting from it, as in Gen. xxv. 31, 32, 33, 34, and xliii. 33. It is indeed applied to *first fruits*, or fruits *first ripe*, but this evidently refers

to its radical signification of *first born* : nor can any instance be adduced of the application of the term in the figurative sense of *finest and best*, contended for by Grotius, unless such a signification be tacitly supposed to attach in all cases to the idea of the *first*, or *earliest*, in its kind. He has indeed referred us to the expression *בכור מות* in Job xviii. 13 : to the use of the word *בכרים*, applied to the fruit of the fig tree ; and to the force of the term *בכור*, employed to denominate the species of camel, distinguished for its swiftness. But none of these instances can bear him out.

The first, which he would arbitrarily render, "*morbus maxime lethalis*," is no more than the *FIRST-BORN of Death*, a strong poetical expression ; for the more particular meaning of which see Parkhurst on the word, and Chappelow on Job xviii. 13. The second, which, he says, implies "*figus maxime fructifera*," is an expression peculiarly unfortunate, as the word in this application is used to denote that species of fig, which is *early ripe* : insomuch that at this day the word *Boccôre** (*בכור*) signifies, in the Levant, the *early fig*, as Shaw states in his travels, p. 370. fol. As to the third instance, the reason of applying this term to the fleetest species of camel, is not the general idea of distinction and superiority, but the peculiar quality of *swiftness* : the idea of *celerity* and *prevention* being most appositely conveyed by a term, whose radical signification implied the *first* or *earliest*. In this sense the word is explained in the kindred dialects, of the Syriac, and (particularly) the Arabic : for which see Schindler and Castel. Indeed, no lexicon whatever, so far as I can discover, supports Grotius in the *general*

* See Lowth's Isai. xxviii. 4. Blayney's Jer. xxiv. 2. and Newcome's Hos. ix. 10.

signification which he attributes to the word. But all concur, in giving to it the meaning of the *earliest*, or *first produced*, or some other flowing from, and connected with, these.

Again, with respect to the word חלב, although it is undoubtedly used in several places to signify *milk*, as well as *fat*, yet, as Heidegger remarks, (Hist. Patr. Exercit. v. §. 20. tom. i.) there is not a single passage in Scripture, in which it is applied in that sense, when sacrifice is spoken of, and the offering is said to be מחלב.

But moreover, as to Grotius' notion, that the *wool* and *milk* were the parts of the animal, which alone were offered by Abel on this occasion, it is notorious, that neither one nor the other is ever mentioned in Scripture, as an offering to the Deity, unless this single passage be supposed to supply an instance. Kennicot also contends, in opposition to Grotius, that the strict analogy of translation will not admit the possibility of his construction of this passage of Genesis. For if, says he, "it be allowed by all, that *Cain's bringing of the fruit of the ground*, means his bringing *the fruit of the ground*, then Abel's *bringing of the firstlings of his flock*, must likewise mean his bringing *the firstlings of his flock*," the exact sameness in the original phrase requiring an exact similarity in the translation. (Two Dissert. pp. 192, 193.) The passage indeed needs but to be read, to prove the whimsical conceit of this comment of Grotius. Not one word is said of *wool*, or that can lead the mind to it by any conceivable reference: but yet, because he is determined not to allow the sacrifice of Abel to have been an oblation of the animal itself; and there being no part of it that could be offered, without slaying the animal, except the wool and the milk; he is

therefore led to pronounce, that in the offering of these the sacrifice consisted.

Nothing, in truth, can be more strangely chimerical, than the whole of Grotius' observations on this part of Scripture. His criticism on the words מִפְּרִי הָאֲרָמָה, furnishes another extraordinary specimen. By these words, he says, nothing more is meant, than what the Heathens in later times understood by their *Sagmen*, which was a sort of turf, cut out of sacred ground, and carried sometimes in the hand of a Roman ambassador. On this Hiedegger is compelled to exclaim—"Sæpe vir, cætera magnus, ex paganis ritibus talia, obtorto collo, ad explicationem rerum sacrarum rapit; quæ, si propius intueare, nec cælum nec terram attingunt." (Exercit. v. §. 19.) But to return.—

With respect to the word חֶלְבֶּהֶן, it may be right to remark, that instead of, *the fat* THEREOF, (which is ambiguous) it may with more propriety be rendered, *the fat* OF THEM, meaning thereby, *the fattest* or *best among the firstlings*. It is well known, that the word חֶלֶב, is often used for the *best of its kind*. Thus חֶלֶב חִטָּה, is the *finest* of the wheat, Ps. lxxxi. 16. cxlvii. 14. And the *fat* of the oil, the *fat* of the wine, stand for the *best* of the oil and wine, and have been so translated,* Numb. xviii. 12. It is the more necessary to make this distinction, lest the particular mention of the *fat* might lead to the supposition that the sacrifice was a *peace offering*, the *fat* of which was consumed upon the altar, and the flesh eaten by the priests and the person at whose charge the offering was made. This was clearly an offering of a later date. The use of animal food

* See Chrysost. Jun. Vatab. also Jen. Jew. Antiq. vol. i. p. 149. and Ken. Two Diss. pp. 193, 194.

was not as yet permitted. And the sacrifice seems to have been an *holocaust*, the whole of which was consumed upon the altar. That the sacrifice was of this kind, many arguments concur to render probable. (See p. 388 of vol. i. of this work, also Shuck. Connect. vol. i. p. 81.) But it is placed beyond the possibility of doubt, if it be admitted, with the authorities and reasons adduced in p. 438—439, of the first volume, that the sign of the divine acceptance of Abel's sacrifice was the consumption of it by fire from heaven. Porphyry, in his 2d book, *De Abstin. Anim.* considers this a sufficient reason to pronounce the offering of Abel to have been a *holocaust*, and compares it with that of Solomon described in 2 Chr. viii. 1. where it is said, that *when Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt-offering* (or holocaust) *and the sacrifices.*

NO. LXI.—ON THE DIFFERENCE IN THE DIVINE RECEPTION OF THE SACRIFICES OF CAIN AND ABEL.

PAGE 39. (p)—To those who reject the divine institution of sacrifice, this has always proved a stumbling block; and to remove the difficulty, various solutions have been elaborately, but unsuccessfully devised. The difference in the treatment of the two brothers had been accounted for by ancient commentators, from the *different mode of division* of their several oblations, as if Cain's fault had consisted in not giving to God the *best* parts, or the *proper* parts of the sacrifice. This unintelligible notion, which an early enemy of revelation, Julian, failed not to urge against Christians, took its rise from the Septuagint translation of Gen. iv. 7. *Οὐκ εἰαν ὀρθῶς προσενεγκῆς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διελῆς, ἡμαρτες;* —*If you should rightly offer, but yet not rightly divide, would you not sin?*

Others have held, that the difference arose from this, that whilst Abel brought of the *firstlings* of his flock, Cain did not in like manner bring of the *first*, or *best* of his fruits. This idea, for which there appears no farther foundation in the original, than that it is *simply* stated that Cain brought *of the fruits*, originated with Philo, (as may be seen in p. 218, vol. i. of this work,) and has had the support of several Christian commentators. See Cyril. cont. Julian. lib. x. p. 349. ed. Spanh. Lips. and Pol. Synop. in Gen. iv. 3. Hallet also, in his note (s) on Hebr. xi. 4. concurs in this idea, and at the same time adds, that Abel's faith *caused* him to select the choicest for sacrifice. Primate Newcombe, in his new version, seems to adopt the same notion, explaining the *more excellent sacrifice* in Hebr. xi. 4. as "consisting of more *choice and valuable* offerings."

Again, the reason of the difference assigned by Josephus (Antiq. Jud. lib. i. c. 3.) is, that "God was more pleased with the spontaneous productions of nature, than with an offering extorted from the earth by the ingenuity and force of man." This strange conceit has been confined to Josephus, and the Rabbins, from whom Havercamp affirms, and Cunæus and Heidegger fully prove, it was derived by this author—see Krebs. Observ. in Nov. Test. p. 383.

Another reason assigned is the difference of moral character. But the history clearly connects the fact of the acceptance of the one and the rejection of the other, with the nature and circumstances of the respective oblations.

Again, it is said, that Cain's entertaining a design against his brother's life, laid the foundation for the difference of treatment. But this intention against his brother's life, is expressly affirmed to have been the *consequence* of the preference given to his brother's offering.

Dr. Priestley has observed* (Theol. Rep. vol. i. p. 195.) that “the actions of both the brothers” (in the offerings made by them of the flock and of the fruits) “seem to have been of the same nature, and to have had exactly the same meaning.” In this I entirely agree with him. Viewed in the light of reason merely, the distinction made between them by the Deity is utterly unaccountable. Sacrifices being considered as *gifts*, or as *federal rites*, or as *symbolical actions* expressing the dispositions and sentiments of the offerer, or in any way that *human invention* can be conceived to have devised them; the actions of the two brothers appear to stand precisely on the same ground, each bringing an offer-

* This Essay of Dr. Priestley’s, in which, (as it has been stated in p. 385 of the first volume of this work) he has laboured to disprove the divine institution of sacrifices, and to establish their mere human invention as springing from anthropomorphitical notions of the Deity, it may be curious to compare with his latest observations on this subject in his *Notes*. &c. on Gen. iv. 3. There, in treating of the offerings of Cain and Abel, he expressly asserts his belief in the *divine origin* of sacrifices. “On the whole (he says) it seems most probable, that men were *instructed by the Divine Being himself* in this mode of worship,” (sacrifice,) “as well as taught many other things that were necessary to their subsistence and comfort.”

This observation, together with those which have been already referred to, (p. 381—383 of the first vol.) cannot be read without wonder, when it is considered, that the author of them had spent a life, in the continued endeavour to refute the assertions which they contain. This, however, after all, but shews the vast difference there is between the disputant and the enquirer. The wonder is easily removed by the view already taken of this matter in p. 384 of the first volume. And, upon the whole, there seems good reason to think, that had Dr. Priestley been permitted, for a longer period, to enjoy that freedom from angry polemics, which was indulged to the few concluding years of his life, he would have grown into a juster acquaintance with many of the vital truths of Scripture, and would have retracted many of those noxious opinions which he had so long and so assiduously toiled to disseminate.

ing of that which he respectively possessed, and each thus manifesting his acknowledgment and worship of the great author of his possessions.

But what do I infer from this? That reason cannot untie the knot; and that to revelation consequently we must look for the solution. Here the difficulty vanishes, and all appears connected and satisfactory, as I trust is shewn in the account given of this matter in the second of these Discourses—see p. 39—45. vol. i.

The words of Cloppenburg on this subject deserve to be noticed: “Etsi diversæ oblationi videatur occasionem præbuisse diversum vitæ institutum, ipsi tamen diversitati oblationis hoc videtur subesse, quod Abel pecudum oblatione cruentâ ante omnia curavit, το ιλασθριον δια της τιξεως εν τω αιματι, *propitiationem per fidem in sanguine*, quo necessario purificanda erant dona Deo oblata, Heb. ix. 22, 23.—Cainus autem oblatione solâ Eucharisticâ de fructu terræ defungens, supinè neglexerit sacrificium ιλασικον, ut eo nomine Deo displicuerit, neque potuerit, obtinere *Justitiæ Dei, quæ ex fide est, testimonium*, quod non perhibebat Deus, neglecto istoc externo symbolo supplicationis ex fide pro remissione peccatorum obtinendâ. Quemadmodum ergo, in cultu spirituali, publicanus supplicans cum peccatorum εξομολογησει, descendit in domum suam justificatus præ pharisæo, cum gratiarum actione, Deo vovente decimas omnium quæ possidebat, Luc. xviii. 12.—sic censemus hâc parte potiolem fuisse Abelis oblationem præ oblatione Caini, quod ipse supplicationem suam pro impetrandâ peccatorum remissione testatus sit, per sacrificii propitiatorii cruentam oblationem, cum alter dona sua eucharistico ritu offerret, χωρις αιματοχυσιας.” *Sacrif. Patriarch. Schola.* p. 15. On the subject of this Number see Ken-
nic. Two Dissert. p. 225—238. and Barrington’s
Misc. Sacr. p. 69—71.

NO. LXII.—ON THE TRUE MEANING OF THE PHRASE,
 ΠΛΕΙΟΝΑ ΘΥΣΙΑΝ, ATTRIBUTED TO THE SACRIFICE OF
 ABEL.

PAGE 40. (q)—Dr. Kennicot's criticism on this passage combined with Gen. iv. 4. is too remarkable to be passed over in silence. The words, *πλεיוνα θυσιαν*, he contends, should be rendered a sacrifice *greater*, or *more*, in reference to *number*, rather than to *value*: for that, although *πολυς* in the positive sense does sometimes signify *excellens*, *præstans*, yet in the other degrees of comparison it is never so used; but that *πλειων* has constantly the signification of *plus*, *amplior*, *copiosior*, or *numerosior*: and for this he refers to the several lexicons of Budæus, Constantine, Gesner, Hederic, Leigh, Scapula and Stephens: and from Stephen's Concordance he says it appears, that *πλειων* has not the sense of *præstantior*, through the whole of the New Testament. The idea of *number*, he says, necessarily strikes us; and therefore Wickliffe's, which reads a MUCH MORE *sacrifice*, he affirms to be a just translation; and that Queen Elizabeth's version was right, in preserving the force of this by rendering the words, *a greater sacrifice*.

In conformity with these observations he suggests an interpretation of Gen. iv. 4. which, I apprehend, is peculiar to himself: namely, that Cain brought a *single* offering of the fruits of the ground; and Abel a *double* oblation, consisting likewise of the fruits, and of an animal sacrifice besides. His principal argument in support of this novel idea, is derived from the use of the word *Mincha* in this place; the meaning of which, he says, is fixed precisely in Levit. ii. 1. and confined to an unbloody oblation, viz. a *meat-offering*; or, as we generally appropriate the word *meat* to *flesh*, more properly a *bread offering*. This term, he argues, being here

applied to Abel's oblation, and being totally inapplicable to the *animal* sacrifice which he is expressly said to have offered, it follows, that he must *likewise* have made an offering of the fruit of the ground such as Cain had brought. And this, he contends, the very turn of expression in the original strongly indicates: for that, in strictness, the passage should be rendered, "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground, a Mincha to Jehovah—and Abel brought (the same,) he *also* (brought) of the firstlings," &c.

for that in the words והבֹלֵב הֵבִיא גַם הוּא, the particle גַם cannot be joined to the verb immediately preceding, from the nature of the position, and its connexion with a second nominative case—and that, agreeably to this, the Seventy have rendered the clause, Καὶ Ἀβελ ἤνεγκε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων.

This criticism of Dr. Kennicot seems, however, unworthy of so great a name; for even admitting that the particle גַם is to be connected, not with the preceding verb, but with the second nominative case, the inference drawn by Dr. Kennicot will by no means follow; there being no form of expression more familiar to the Hebrew, than the emphatic repetition of the person spoken of, with this particle גַם adjoined. To adduce instances of this were idle, as it is one of the most common idioms of the language. Whoever wishes for examples, however, may find them in sufficient plenty, in Nold. Concord. Partic. Ebr. pp. 201, 202. Now, in this application of the particle, it is manifest, that the whole of Dr. Kennicot's construction falls to the ground. Again, admitting the particle to be used in the additive sense, *also*, as Dr. Kennicot's view of the passage requires, yet will not this justify his translation; since, being necessarily connected with the second nominative case by this writer's

own admission, it can only mean, that Abel *also, as well as* Cain, brought an offering; whereas, according to Dr. Kennicot, it must signify, that he brought, *also of* the firstlings, &c. i. e. he brought not only what Cain had brought, but *besides, or in addition to that*, of the firstlings of his flock; to make out which translation, the word *also* must be connected, not with the second nominative case הוּא, or αὐτος, but with the following words, מִנְכִּיִּים, or ἀπο τῶν πρωτοτόκων, from which it is entirely disjoined by the intervening pronoun. Thus Dr. Kennicot becomes inconsistent with himself, having first contended for the immediate conjunction of the particle with the second nominative case, and having then applied it in such a sense as to require its conjunction, not with this nominative case, but with another part of the sentence.

But he relies on the force of the word *Mincha*, which is applied only to Abel's offering: the Lord being said to have had *respect to Abel and to his MINCHA*. It is then of importance to ascertain the true meaning of this word; and the more so because if this writer's sense of the term be admitted, and at the same time his theory of the *double* oblation be rejected, the necessary inference is that no animal was slain by Abel, but that the offering must have been of the unbloody kind, and consequently that it was, as Grotius has contended, merely an offering of the milk and wool of his flock.

Now, it is in the first place to be remarked, that he explains the word *Mincha*, as applied to the offerings of Cain and Abel, by the exact definition of it, as we find it specifically used under the law, where it appears to be confined to offerings of the unbloody kind. (See Two Dissert. p. 138—192.) But if Dr. Kennicot be right in explaining the *Mincha* in all cases by the strictness of the Levitical

definition, then it necessarily follows, that Cain did not merely bring an offering *of the fruits of the ground*, but that he brought the *very kind of meat-offering*, or *Mincha*, appointed in the ii. ch. of Levit. where, as Kennicot emphatically observes, the description of the *meat-offering* concludes with these words, מנחה חוץ, THIS IS A MINCHA. Cain's offering, then, must have consisted of "fine flour with oil poured upon it, and frankincense placed thereon." The exact quantities also of the flour and oil, as prescribed in the law, must have been employed. This the force of Kennicot's argument indispensably requires. For he contends that the *very definition* of the *Mincha*, as given in Leviticus, "determines the sense of the word absolutely in the five books of Moses: for that wherever the inspired author mentions the word *Mincha*, as a sacrificial term, he must certainly use it in the same sense; the same, which had been settled upon it by God himself, before Genesis was composed."

Now, it is certain, that wherever the MINCHA, properly so called, is spoken of *under* the law, it must be understood in the sense expressly given to it *by* the law; and in this reference it is, that Buxtorf, Reland, Outram, and Jos. Mede, (whom Kennicot quotes in justification of his opinion,) seem to have spoken of the *Mincha*. But surely, when applied to oblations *antecedent* to the law, the term is not necessarily to be taken in that restrained sense, to which its general signification was limited, in later times, by those appropriate circumstances attached to it by the legal institution. It is undoubtedly true, as Gussetius, who is referred to by Kennicot, remarks, that a *Mincha* presented to God signifies an unbloody oblation. But when he says, that it *always* does so, and that "there is not one instance of its being used for an animal oblation throughout the

Bible." (Comment. Ling. Ebr. p. 473.) he, in the first place, begs the question respecting the sacrifice of Abel, which is expressly called a *Mincha*: secondly, he forgets that every other instance of its sacrificial application, is an instance of the use of the term *under* the law, by which its original meaning had been narrowed: and lastly, both he and Kennicott materially err in point of fact, the word *Mincha* being frequently employed even under the law, to denote *animal sacrifices*, as well as the *bread* or *flour-offerings*. Thus in 1 Kings xviii. 29, 36. 2 Kings iii. 20. and Ezra ix. 4, 5. we find the morning and evening sacrifices, which beside a bread-offering and drink-offering, included also the offering of a lamb, described by the general appellation of *Mincha*. In Judg. vi. 18. the same term is applied to the offering of a kid with unleavened cakes. And in 1 Sam. ii. 17. and Mal. i. 13, 14. it is used in relation to animal sacrifice, in a manner the most explicit and unqualified. So that, although, as Rosenmuller on Levit. ii. 1. affirms, this word be applied *per eminentiam* to the oblation of Corn, yet even under the law we find its more general signification force its way.

This proves decisively the weakness of Dr. Kennicott's argument derived from the supposition that the words, מנחה הוא (Lev. ii. 6.) are to be understood in the sense, THIS IS A MINCHA, i. e. as marking the precise meaning of the term, wherever it occurred in a sacrificial relation. Indeed the circumstances of the *various* kinds of *Bread-offerings*, comprehended under the term *Mincha*, which Kennicott himself admits to have existed, (p. 190—192.) and of which there were not fewer than five, proves that this passage could not have been intended here as *confining* the term to the specific oblation to which it refers; and that it could only mean, that

this oblation was one of those, which might be included under the term *Mincha*. Vatablus renders the words, "*Munus est : i. e. tale est munus quod offerri debet Deo.*" See also Fagius, Vatablus, Castalio, on Exod. xxx. 9.

It is certain that the true and original signification of the word, is that of *an offering presented to a superior*. Thus we find it in Gen. xxxii. 20. and xliii. 11. 15. in which places it is used for the purpose of appeasing : again, in 2 Chr. xxxii. 23. and Ps. lxxii. 10. where it is applied to offerings brought by strangers to the temple at Jerusalem : and also in 1 kings x. 25. 2. Chr. ix. 24. 2 Kings viii. 8, 9. where it is used to denote the gifts sent to earthly princes. The word appears to be derived from an Arabic verb, signifying *donavit* : see Rosenm. and Le Clerc on Lev. ii. 1. and Schindl. Lexic. Pentag. Parkhurst derives it from the Hebrew verb נָחַ, *quievit, posuit*, and *Calasio* from נָחַה, *duxit*, without however making any change in the signification. From this it follows, that all sacrificial offerings, whether bloody or unbloody, must fall under the general denomination, *Mincha*. That it is taken in this large sense by all Lexicographers, Le Clerc (on Lev. ii. 1.) positively asserts. See also Castell, and especially Parkhurst, on the word.

Drusius (on Hebr. xi. 4.) affirms, that it is of greater extent than is commonly admitted. Ainsworth observes (on Lev. ii. 1.) that it "was *generally* any solemn gift or present, to God, or man : *in special*, a present or sacrifice unto God : *more specially*, an offering of the fruits of the earth." Sykes also (Essay, &c. p. 17.) uses the word in the same *general* sense, whilst he admits, that "later use has pretty much confined it to oblations of flour or meal."

How little reason then Dr. Kennicot had for in-

roducing so novel and dangerous a criticism, is, I trust upon the whole sufficiently evident. How inconsistent also it is with the ideas of sacrifice, which he holds, in common with the doctrine maintained in these discourses, will appear, when it is considered, that if in the case of Abel's oblation, the word *Mincha* be supposed to relate, not to the sacrifice of the animal, but solely to an offering of the fruits with which it was accompanied, it must follow, since God is said to have had respect to his *Mincha*, that it was not the animal sacrifice, but the offering of the fruits, which conciliated the divine regard. And thus the theory, which pronounces the *animal sacrifice* to have been originally enjoined, as a type of the great sacrifice of Christ; and which ascribes to this, as the instituted expression of the true faith, the superiority of Abel's offering over that of Cain, is at once overturned. And yet to this very theory it is, that Dr. Kennicot, in his Dissertation on the Oblations of Cain and Abel, has given his warmest support.

Perhaps it may not be amiss here, to endeavour to fix the true meaning and value of the sacrificial terms, קרבן, מנחה, and זבח, *Corban*, *Mincha*, and *Zebach*: and the more particularly, as their relative force seems not to have been stated with exactness by any late writer. The first of these terms, being derived from קרב, signifies whatever was *brought to God before the altar*: whether dismissed, as the scape-goat; dedicated to the service of the Sanctuary, as the sacred vessels, and the conductors of the sacred rites, the Levites; or offered up, as the sacrifices properly so called, which were consumed at the altar. Again, the *Mincha* was an oblation, which was of the nature of a sacrifice, being *consumed at the altar*, whether it consisted of

things animate or inanimate, although, as we have seen, the Mosaic institution in a good degree narrowed its application; confining it, for the most part, to what is called the *meat offering*, or as it should in strictness be denominated the *bread* or *flour-offering*. And lastly, the *Zebach* was the oblation of an animal *slain* in sacrifice. Thus, *Corban* is the most general term, including all sorts of offerings, or dedications, to God in his temple. *Mincha* is the next in order, applying to those offerings which were consumed at the altar. And *Zebach* is the species infima in the scale, relating only to the animal sacrifice.

But to return to Dr. Kennicot, and the immediate subject of this note. His remark on the word $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu$, that it necessarily involves the idea of *number*, becomes now totally inapplicable. The idea of a *double oblation* in the case of Abel, which it was intended to support, has been shewn to be entirely groundless: and indeed his observations on the force of the word $\pi\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu$ itself, seem not less so. That “the notion of *number* is included in every application of the word throughout the New Testament,” is so far from being true, that numerous passages may be cited, in which no such idea can possibly attach to the word. Thus, in Mat. vi. 25. *Is not the soul more* ($\pi\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu$) *than meat?*—and again, xii. 41. *Behold a greater* ($\pi\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu$) *than Jonas is here.* Many other such instances may be seen in Stephanus’s Greek Concordance, to which Dr. Kennicot has referred in support of his opinion. But the true force of the word, both in the positive and the comparative, may be best seen in Schleusner’s Lexicon. It will thence appear, that the just value of the expression in the passage in Hebrews has been given in the text: a more *ample*, or *fuller* sacrifice, expressing in emphatical terms, that which partook

more *largely* and *essentially* of the true nature and virtue of sacrifice. Vatablus renders the word *uberiorem*.

NO. LXIII.—ON THE NATURE AND GROUNDS OF THE FAITH EVIDENCED BY THE SACRIFICE OF ABEL.

PAGE 40. (r)—FAITH, (we are informed by the apostle, Romans, x. 17.) *cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*. This account of *Faith* combined with the numerous examples exhibited in the xith ch. of Hebrews, in illustration of its nature, can leave us at no loss to pronounce, that Abel's offering was in obedience to a divine revelation. For it must be remarked, that in the several instances adduced in this chapter, of persons actuated by this exalted principle, the belief of something declared, and a mode of action conformable to that belief, are uniformly exhibited. In like manner, then, as Noah, Abraham, and the rest, are represented, as acting in consequence of a divine command, placing an entire reliance in the promise of him who commanded; so Abel, in the sacrifice which he offered, must be supposed to have acted under the same impression—believing what God had promised, and therefore sacrificing as God had ordered. Indeed, as Heidegger remarks, the divine revelation was in his case even more necessary, than in any other of those mentioned.

The sacred writer again informs us, at the 13th verse of the same chapter, that Abel and all the others whom he had named, *died in faith* (i. e. as Hallet paraphrases it, “retained their faith until their death, or the time of their leaving the world,”) *not having received the promises*, (not having received the completion of them: that being reserved for later times, as is intimated in the concluding

part of the chapter, and is clearly expressed in Acts xiii. 32, 33: *We declare unto you glad tidings, how that THE PROMISE which was made unto the FATHERS, God hath FULFILLED the same UNTO US THEIR CHILDREN) but having seen them afar off; and were persuaded of them, and embraced them.*

Now, that these promises included the *promise of the Messiah*, Kennicot says, is plain: "first, because this is THE PROMISE, peculiarly and emphatically so called throughout Scripture: and secondly, because that the temporal promises, respecting the land of Canaan, cannot alone, if at all, be meant here, as the apostle speaks of *all* the patriarchs, whom he had mentioned in the beginning of the chapter: and Abraham, who is one of those mentioned, is expressly said to have *sojourned in the land of Promise*; whilst, on the other hand, Abel, Enoch, and Noah, (three of the patriarchs included in the word ALL,) had not received the promise of *entering the land of Canaan*. So that *some other* promise, made in the first ages, and frequently repeated, must be that to which the apostle here alludes. And what promise can that be, but *the promise of a future Redeemer* made to Adam?"—the promise, that *the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head*: a promise which was to be commemorated in the patriarchal and all succeeding sacrifices, *until the seed should come*. Agreeably to this, the Homily on Faith applies this xith ch. of Hebrews, stating, that holy men of old, although they were not named Christian, yet exercised a Christian faith; seeking, as we do, all the benefits of God the Father, *through the merits of his Son Jesus Christ*; and differing from us only in this, that whereas "they looked *when Christ should come*, we be in the time *when he is come*."

To the fulfilment of *this promise* then, was the

faith of Abel directed; and the enjoined manifestation of this faith, the apostle justifies us in pronouncing, to have been the kind of sacrifice which he offered; and which, as being of the true nature of the sacrifice required of the faithful, procured from God that acceptance, and witnessing of his offerings, which was refused to Cain. See Heideg. Hist. Patr. Exerc. iii. § 52. tom. i.—Shuckf. Connect. vol. i. pp. 86, 87.—Kennic. Two Dissert. p. 212—215. and Edwards's Survey of the various Methods, pp. 99, 100. See also Witsius, (Misc. Sac. Lib. II. Diss. ii. §. 7.—10.) who removes the objections brought by Spencer against the application of this chapter of Hebrews, here contended for; and Jen. Jew. Ant. vol. i. p. 57—59. where some excellent remarks are to be found, on the difficulty, which the mention of *Jephthah*, in the catalogue of distinguished believers, might appear to create.

It must be confessed, that certain commentators, among whom are to be reckoned Grotius, Hammond, Le Clerc, Rosenmuller, and Primate Newcome, also if I rightly understand him, interpret the *promises* alluded to in this chapter as *temporal*; and are consequently reduced to the necessity of confining the expression, οὗτοι πάντες, *ALL these*, in the 13th verse, to *some* of those that had been named; or of referring it to *ALL the descendants of Abraham*, of whom mention had been made in the sentence immediately preceding. Now, it is obvious, as Whitby remarks, that *all* the descendants of Abraham did *not* die in faith: and how, on the other hand, any particular individuals of those before named, can be selected by an expression, which comprehends *ALL*, it is not easy to discover. And if *all*, who had been before named, are referred to, (as is unavoidable,) then, as we have already seen, the promises cannot have been temporal, there be-

ing some to whom no temporal promises were made, as Abel and Enoch. As to the difficulty arising from the declaration, that the persons enumerated had *DIED in faith*, when it is known that Enoch did *not die*, but was translated; this is easily removed by considering, that the stress in this clause is not laid upon the *death* of those believers, but upon their having *retained their faith through life*, as is well marked in Hallet's paraphrase, quoted in p. 17 of this volume, and in the common use of language would naturally be conveyed in the words here used by the apostle. See Drusius, in loc. who supplies several instances of a similar latitude of expression in Scripture. Hallet, Doddridge, and Whitby, deserve to be consulted upon this entire chapter. They furnish a complete answer to the arguments of those who contend for a temporal promise.

I shall only add here an observation of Elsner, on the extravagant eagerness, shewn by two of these commentators, Grotius, and Le Clerc, in defence of the temporal solution. Having remarked that Le Clerc condemns Hammond, for his *mystical* interpretation of the *city which has foundations*, as implying an everlasting mansion in the Heavens; and that he approves of the idea of Grotius, that Jerusalem was the city here intended: he exclaims, "Mira est viri illius τη υποθεσει δουλευοντος imprudentia: quomodo quæso exspectasse illam urbem Abrahamus dicetur, quam post multa demum sæcula posteris suis cessuram noverat a Deo edoctus? — quomodo deinde Deus conditor vocabitur *Hierosolymæ terrestris*? — denique infra, v. 16. *cælum* esse illam urbem apparet, nam *patria cælestis* vocatur. Simplicius quoque ad Epictetum, cap. xii. p. 77. in morte reperiri την αληθινην πατριδα dixit, *de beatiss. sedibus*. Observat. Sac. tom. ii. p. 367.

NO. LXIV.—ON THE PROBABLE TIME AND OCCASION OF THE
INSTITUTION OF SACRIFICE.

PAGE 40. (s)—The event, which, according to the principle of sacrifice maintained in the page here referred to, gave birth to the establishment of the rite, seems obviously to determine the *time* of its institution. The commission of sin, and the promise of a Redeemer, being the grand objects of its reference, no period seems more fit for its appointment, than that, at which sin first entered, and the Promise was first delivered: that is, the period immediately succeeding the Fall. And indeed, the *manner* in which the first sacrifice recorded in Scripture is introduced in the narrative, strongly indicates the pre-existence of the rite; the words **מִקֵּץ יָמִים**, intimating (as Kennicot has shewn in the second of his Two Dissertations, p. 177—183.) a *stated time* for the performance of this duty: and the whole turn of phrase marking a previous and familiar observance. See Richie's Peculiar Doctrines, Part II. §. 42. vol. i. p. 138.

If, then, sacrifice be admitted to have been coeval with the fall, every argument, which has been adduced to prove that Abel offered sacrifices in obedience to the *divine injunction*, will apply with increased force to shew, that Adam must have done the same. Scripture also supplies additional confirmation, by the fact, which it relates, of the first pair having been, by the express command of God, clothed with the skins of beasts. Much as some have endeavoured to depreciate the value of this fact, it will be found, when more closely examined, to supply a strong evidence on this head. That the beasts, whose skins were allotted for covering to our first parents, had been slain, is natural to suppose; as it is not reasonable to think that any ani-

imals had died of themselves, so soon after their creation, and without having yet experienced any severity of climate or situation. Now, there were no purposes for which they could have been slain, unless those of food, sacrifice, or covering. That they were not slain for food, has been, it is hoped, sufficiently established in Number LII. Neither can it be admitted, that they were slain merely for covering; since it cannot be supposed, that Adam would, immediately after the sentence of the divine displeasure, have dared to kill God's creatures without his permission; nor is it likely, that God should order them to be slain solely for their skins, when man could have been supplied with sufficient covering from the hair and wool; and when, the flesh of the animal not being permitted for food, there must have been an unnecessary waste of the creatures. It follows, then, that they had been slain with a view to sacrifice. This alone supplies an adequate reason. The *whole* of the animal (if the offering be supposed an *holocaust*, as there is good reason to conclude all to have been,* until the Mosaic institution) would here be devoted to the uses of religion, except the skin, which would be employed for the purpose of clothing. And even *this* might not be without its moral and religious end, as it might serve to our first parents for a constant memorial of their transgression; of the death which it merited; and of the divine mercy by which that death was withheld. It seems also not unlikely, that from this institution was derived the appointment in Lev. vii. 8. that the priest should have the *skin* of the burnt-offering. See particularly on the subject of this Number, Kennic. Two Diss. pp. 67—

* See p. 388 of vol. i. and pp. 5, 6. of this volume—also Number LXVII.

70. 227, 228. and Wits. Misc. Sacr. Lib. II. Diss. ii. §. 12.—also Heideg. Histor. Patr. Exercit. v. §. 16. Delan. Rev. Exam. vol. i. diss. viii. p. 99—103. Bar-ringt. Miscell. Sacr. vol. iii. pp. 17. 67. Shuckf. Connect. vol. i. b. 2. pp. 80, 81. and Patr. and Ainsw. on Gen. iii. 21.

A translation, indeed, has been given of the passage in Gen. iii. 9. which subverts the entire of the argument derived from the *skins* given to the first pair for clothing, by referring the word עור to the skin of Adam and his wife, and reading it in this sense, “that God made for them coats, or coverings of *their* skin.” Cloppenburg remarks, (Sacrif. Patriarch. Sch. p. 13.) that the word עור is *never* to be found in Scripture, in any other signification, than that of the *hide of an animal*. Kennicot also concurs in this criticism, with one slight and conjectural exception. But the truth is, there are many exceptions, which these distinguished scholars must have hastily overlooked. Exod. xxxiv. 30. Job x. 11. xix. 20. 26. with others which may be seen in Cocceius, Schindler, and Calasio, and need not be enumerated, supply examples as strong as that, which has been noticed by Kennicot, from Exod. xxii. 26. But, although the word is in these several instances applied to the *human skin*, yet the form and construction of the passage before us will not admit it here. It is here introduced *absolutely*, and without any of those connecting parts of speech which might mark its relation to the persons spoken of, whilst in the passages above referred to, the relation is always so pointed out. On the supposition that the human skin is here meant, the last named passage, viz. Exod. xxii. 26. exactly corresponds to this, *the raiment for his skin*, in the one, agreeing precisely with the *covering for their skin*, in the

other. But there the word has the preposition ל, and the pronoun suffixed to it, לעורו : in like manner, both of these, or at least the suffixed pronoun (עורם) would undoubtedly have been used here, had the skin of *the persons covered* been intended ; whereas the word עור is introduced absolute and unconnected. See Kennic. Two Dissert. pp. 68, 69. Accordingly the LXX, and all the ancient versions, except the Chaldee, have uniformly rendered the sentence in its present received acceptation.

So little deserving of serious attention, did the translation, which has been here discussed, appear to Dr. Lardner, that in his Essay on the Mosaic account, &c. (Kippis's edit. vol. xi. pp. 239. 249.) when engaged in a direct examination of the subject, he does not condescend to notice it, at the same time that he observes upon Le Clerc's interpretation, which is scarcely less extraordinary : viz. that the word, כתנור, does not signify *coats*, but *tents* : so that the covering provided for Adam and his wife, were not *coats*, but *tents, of skins*. In this, however, Le Clerc has nothing to support him but his own ingenuity of invention. The word כתונה, which is exactly the Greek χιτων, being *never* used to signify any thing but a garment. And even if it were, it seems rather extraordinary, as Kennicot remarks, that God should take care to make a tent or habitation for the first pair *in Paradise*, when, in the very next words we read of God's turning them *out of Paradise*. This however is not the only instance, in which Le Clerc has indulged an arbitrary fancy,* in his Comments on Scripture.

* Whoever wishes to be satisfied of the levity of Le Clerc's occasional strictures on Scripture, may consult the dissertation of Witsius, on the Author of the Pentateuch, in his *Miscellanea Sacra*, (tom. i. p. 106—130.) in which he discusses, at consider-

NO. LXV.—ON THE TRUE INTERPRETATION OF THE PASSAGE, GEN. IV. 7. CONTAINING GOD'S EXPOSTULATION WITH CAIN.

PAGE 43. (*t*)—The plain, natural, and significant interpretation, which in the page here noticed has been given to a part of Scripture, which had long exercised, but to puzzle and perplex the Commentators, was first proposed by the learned Lightfoot, (see his Works, vol. ii. pp. 1085. 1243.) and has since been adopted by Kennicot, (Two Dissert. pp. 216, 217.) and Pilkington (Remarks, &c. p. 163.) The use of the word חֲטָאת, *Sin*, for a *Sin-offering*, is so familiar, that it can scarcely be necessary to adduce instances in proof of it. Examples of it may be seen in Exod. xxix. 14. xxx. 10. Levit. iv. 3. 21. 24. 29. vi. 25.—2 Kings xii. 16. Ezech. xlv. 23. Hos. iv. 8. and in numerous other passages. On this idiom, see also what has been said in p. 179—184, of the first vol. of this work, and in Pilkington's Remarks, pp. 163, 164.

But the translation of the passage here given,

able length and with much force, the objections urged by Le Clerc against the received opinion that the Pentateuch was the work of Moses. It is true, indeed, that Le Clerc afterwards retraced his steps; and in the third dissertation of the *Prolegomena* of his commentary on the Old Testament, refuted the several objections which he had himself before advanced. The rashness, however, which, upon so important a subject, could have led to so wild a theory as this writer had set up, in opposition to the suffrage of all antiquity, to the authority of Christ and his Apostles, and to the plain evidence of the thing itself, is not done away with, although its mischiefs may be mitigated, by his subsequent recantation. Having made mention of the objections raised against the authenticity of the five books of Moses, I think it right to direct the young reader, in addition to the dissertation of Witsius already noticed, to Bishop Watson's Apology for the Bible in answer to Paine, and to Dr. Graves's Lectures on the Pentateuch.

receives its strongest confirmation from the peculiar force of the word רבץ, which is connected with חטאת, and which strictly implies *couching*, or *lying down as a beast*. For this see Schindler and Castell on the word. And indeed all the Commentators have been obliged to admit this sense of the phrase, even whilst they adopted a translation of the passage, with which it seems but little consistent: the idea of *Sin lying couched* at the door, being, to say the least of it, a *bold* image. Yet in this sense they have been compelled to apply the term. See Fagius, Vatablus, Clarius, Dathe, and Rosenmuller. But the word *Sin-offering* being substituted for *Sin*, the whole difficulty is removed, and the peculiar propriety of the term employed instantly appears.

There is yet another circumstance of some weight which is remarked by Parkhurst, and is also noticed by Castalio, Dathe and Rosenmuller, although they have not drawn from it the natural inference; namely, that חטאת, which is feminine, is here connected with a word of the masculine gender, רבץ; which, as Parkhurst judiciously observes, is perfectly consistent, on the supposition that חטאת denotes a *Sin-offering*: for then according to a construction common in Hebrew, which refers the adjective not to the word but to the *thing* understood by it, the masculine רבץ is here combined with the *animal* which was to be the sin-offering. In conformity with this reasoning it will be found, that חטאת, in other parts of Scripture where it is used for a *Sin-offering*, is, though feminine itself, connected with a masculine adjunct. See Exod. xxix. 14. Levit. iv. 21. 24. v. 9. and other places of Leviticus, where the masculine pronoun הוּא is used instead of the feminine הִיא. But in Gen. xviii. 20. xx. 9. Exod. xxxii. 21. 30. and other places, where the word oc-

curs in its original signification of *Sin*; it has constantly the adjective connected in the *feminine*.

Dr. Geddes was either not aware of this peculiarity, or did not choose to notice it, whilst he laboured so hard in his Critical Remarks (p. 54.) to shew, that there were no authorities to justify the connecting חַטָּאת a *feminine*, in its ordinary sense of *sin*, with a *masculine* adjunct. He has not taken the like pains to shew, that such a connexion is unauthorized, in the application of the word in the sense of *sin-offering*: in which particular application it is, that this anomalous connexion is specially contended for. He has merely contented himself with asserting, (p. 55.) that the rendering the word in *this* sense is liable to the same objections, which he has urged against its application to the sense of *sin*. This he has *asserted*, whilst it will appear upon a single glance, that to every objection which he has advanced, this signification of the term supplies an immediate and satisfactory reply.

The principal difficulty attending the translation of the verse in question, has arisen from the apparent want of connexion between the concluding clause and those which go before. If however the context be well considered, the connexion becomes clear and convincing. Of Cain, who was filled with rage at the preference given to his brother Abel by the acceptance of *his* sacrifice whilst his own was rejected, Jehovah demands the reason of his anger: "*If thou doest well* (says he) *shalt thou not be accepted?* (or rather as the margin of our bible reads, shalt thou not have *the excellency*, or exaltation, above thy brother, which thou conceivest to belong to thy birth-right?) *And if thou doest not well, a sin-offering lieth at thy very door*, to make the due reconciliation, and restore thee to the station which thou hast lost by thy misconduct. So that in either

case it depends upon thyself, that he (thy brother) shall be rendered *subject unto thee, and that thou shalt have the superiority over him.*" This meaning naturally and spontaneously flows from the literal rendering of the passage as it stands connected. *And the Lord said unto Cain, wherefore art thou wroth, &c. (with thy brother?) Is there not, if thou doest well, exaltation; and, if thou doest not well, a sin-offering lying at thy door? And thus he may become subject to thee, and thou mayest have the dominion over him.* It is apprehended that this, which is an exact translation of the original, affords in the view of the above paraphrase, a clear, consistent, and satisfactory sense, of a part of Scripture, which has hitherto caused much trouble to interpreters.

The rendering by the LXX is so very different from this, and from the commonly received translation, that on the first view it would seem to have been derived from a Hebrew original, entirely dissimilar to that, which we at present possess. It therefore will not be unacceptable to the curious reader, to shew how the Greek translators must have considered the text, in order to have derived from it a sense apparently so foreign from its import. They render it thus; *Ουκ, εαν ορθως προσενεγκης, ορθως δε μη διελης, ημαρτες; ησυχασον· προς σε αποσροφη αυτου, και συ αρξεις αυτου*: or, as in some of Holmes's various readings,—*επισροφη αυτου, και συ αυτου αρξης.* *Though you may have rightly offered, yet if you have not rightly divided, have you not sinned? Be at rest. To you shall he submit himself, and you shall rule over him.* Now, if in the original, תִּשָּׁבַע be construed in connexion, making שָׁבַע the infinitive mood, and expressing by תִּשָּׁבַע the *mode*, in which the action denoted by that infinitive was performed;

and if, in like manner, the words **תִּשְׁבַּח לַפֶּתַח** be made to coalesce, whilst **פֶּתַח** is interpreted in the sense of dividing: if **חֲטָאת** be considered as a verb, and **רָבִץ** also as a verb, with a stop preceding and following it:—the sense affixed by the Septuagint may be elicited. For then **שֶׂאת תִּשְׁבַּח** may be rendered *ορθως προσενεγκης*; and **תִּשְׁבַּח לַפֶּתַח**, *ορθως διελης*. **חֲטָאת** also may be rendered by *ημαρτες*, and **רָבִץ** by *ησυχασον*. All this, however, it must be remembered, is to be considered rather possible than natural. For although the infinitive certainly admits such a connexion with the verb **תִּשְׁבַּח**, as to imply the *doing well** that which is expressed by the infinitive, yet the use of the verb **שֶׂאת** for *offering sacrifice*, and of **פֶּתַח** for *dividing*, can scarcely be said to be authorized by any passages in Scripture. Indeed that **פֶּתַח** should admit the sense of *dividing*, it ought to be written **פִּתְחָה**, unless we suppose the word to be taken in the sense of *freely sharing, or imparting*, (which **פֶּתַח** is not incapable of expressing,) and that thence the Greek translators felt themselves justified in extending it to the above signification. As for **רָבִץ** also, it is only by a considerable latitude of figurative application that it can be interpreted as in the Greek; its literal meaning being that of *lying down as an animal*. So that upon the whole the version of the LXX is rather to be defended than approved: whilst the translation by Jerome, and still more that by Theodotion, presents a view of the passage much more natural as well as grammatical.

Jerome's translation runs thus, "Nonne si bene

* Of this construction, Prov. xxx. 29. Psal. xxxiii. 3. Isai. xxiii. 16. Ezech. xxxiii. 32. and many other parts of Scripture supply instances.

egeris, demittetur tibi? Et si non bene egeris, ante fores peccatum tuum sedebit? Et ad te societas ejus: sed tu magis dominare ejus." (Quæst. Hebr. in Genes.) And this again is thus modified in the Roman Vulgate, "Nonne si bene egeris, recipies? Sin autem male, statim in foribus peccatum aderit? Sed sub te erit appetitus ejus, et tu dominaberis illius." In both of these the sense is nearly the same as that in our common English bibles, except that the last clause is applied by the followers of the Vulgate not to *Abel* but to the *sin* just before spoken of, and is interpreted as pronouncing on the full dominion of man over his sinful desires, and asserting the uncontroled freedom* of his will. The Romish writers adduce Jerome's paraphrase† on the text, as clearly proving this to have been his view; and also refer to the authority of Augustine, who specifically argues the point thus, "Tu dominaberis illius; nunquid fratris? absit. Cujus igitur nisi peccati?" On these authorities, together with that of the Jerusalem Targum, the Doway‡ translators

* Erasmus (Hyperaspist. Diatrib. ii. sec. 96.) cites the passage thus: "Sub te erit appetitus tuus, et tu dominaberis illius:" and from this unauthorized reading, deduces an argument in opposition to Luther, on the free will of man.

† In his Questions on Genesis he thus explains the text: "Quod si male egeris, illico peccatum ante vestibulum sedebit, et tali janitore comitaberis: verum, quia liberi arbitrii es, moneo ut non tibi peccatum, sed tu peccato domineris."

‡ Ernesti, in his *Institutio Interpretis Novi Testamenti*, p. 79. exclaims, "Quam multi errores orti sunt in Ecclesiâ ex linguæ Hebraicæ ignorantia! Doctrina de purgatorio, pœnitentia, fide, bonis operibus, et aliæ, ex Augustino quidem et versione vulgatâ proferri quidem, sed adseri et defendi non possunt contra interpretem linguæ Hebraicæ gnarum."—Other reasons, however, very different from mere ignorance of the Hebrew language, have been assigned for the errors in Scripture interpretation, imputable to the advocates of the Church of Rome. *Father Paul* informs us, in one of his Letters, (Letter 25.) that the Pope, complaining of Fra. Fulgentio, said, "that preaching

ground a triumph over the *heretical* (Protestant) versions, whose object in referring the clause to *Abel* and not to *sin*, they conceive to be that of

of the Scriptures is a suspicious thing; and that he, who keeps close to the Scriptures, will ruin the Catholic faith." And again, (Letter 26.) the Pope is made to say of him, "that indeed he made some good Sermons, but bad ones withal: and that he insisted too much upon Scripture; which is a book, to which if any keep close, he will quite ruin the Catholic faith."—And indeed, that the Pope had reason to complain of Fra. Fulgentio's sermons, must be admitted, when we find from Burnet's Life of Bishop Bedell, (p. 119.) that that father, in preaching on the words, *Have ye not read?* took occasion to tell the auditory, that if Christ were now to ask this question, all the answer they could make to it would be; *No, for they were not suffered to do it:* and thence proceeded to remonstrate, with the most animated zeal, against the restraint put on the use of the Scripture by the See of Rome.

In a work, which, within a few years, has obtained the most distinguished mark of approbation, from the highest learned society of a nation holding communion with the church of Rome, we meet with a detailed statement of those causes, which have disqualified the votaries of that Church for the task of Scripture interpretation. After an enumeration of the advantages, derived to the literature and civilization of Christendom, from religious houses, as depositaries of the remains of ancient learning, the author thus proceeds.—"If the Churchmen preserved in this manner the faint tradition of knowledge, it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that in their hands it more than once became dangerous, and was converted by its guardians to pernicious purposes. The domination of Rome, built upon a scaffolding of false historical proofs, had need of the assistance of those faithful auxiliaries, to employ on the one side their half knowledge to fascinate men's eyes, and on the other to prevent those eyes from perceiving the truth, and from becoming enlightened by the torch of criticism. The local usurpations of the Clergy, in several places, were founded on similar claims, and had need of similar means for their preservation. It followed, therefore, both that the little knowledge permitted should be mixed with error, and that the nations should be carefully maintained in profound ignorance, favourable to superstition. Learning, as far as possible, was rendered inaccessible to the laity. The study of the ancient languages was represented as idolatrous and abominable. Above all, the reading of the holy

escaping from the doctrine of free-will; for the hostility to which doctrine, entertained by the first Reformers, they are branded by these translators with

Scriptures, that sacred inheritance of all Christians, was severely interdicted. To read the bible, without the permission of one's superiors, was a crime: to translate it into the vulgar tongue would have been a temerity worthy of the severest punishment. The Popes had indeed their reasons for preventing the word of Jesus Christ from reaching the people, and a direct communication from being established between the Gospel and the Christian. When it becomes necessary to keep in the shade objects as conspicuous as faith and public worship, it behoved the darkness to be universal and impenetrable." Villers's *Essay on the Reformation of Luther*, p. 88—90. The same writer in another place, thus contrasts the characters of the Protestant and Romish Churches, as to their grounds of assent to sacred truths.—"The Church of Rome said, 'Submit, without examination, to authority?' The Protestant Church, said, 'Examine, and submit only to thy own conviction.' The one commanded men to believe blindly: the other taught them, with the Apostle, to reject the bad, and choose only that which is good:" Ibid. p. 294.—And when the Church of Rome was, at length, obliged by the necessities of self defence, to grant to her faithful sons the privilege of theological investigation, in what way does the same writer represent the system of studies permitted for this purpose? The theology of the Romanist, and that of the Protestant, he describes, as "two worlds in opposite hemispheres, which have nothing common except the name."—"The Catholic theology rests (says he) on the inflexible authority of the decisions of the Church, and therefore debars the man who studies it from all free exercise of his reason. It has preserved the jargon, and all the barbarous appendages of the Scholastic philosophy. We perceive in it the work of darkness of the monks of the tenth century. In short, the happiest thing which can befall him who has unfortunately learnt it, is speedily to forget it. The Protestant theology, on the contrary, rests on a system of examination, on the unlimited use of reason. The most liberal exegesis opens for it the knowledge of sacred antiquity; criticism, that of the history of the Church; it regards the doctrinal part, reduced to purity and simplicity, as only the body of religion, the positive form which it requires; and it is supported by philosophy in the examination of the laws of nature, of morality, and of the relations of men to the Divine Being. Whoever wishes to be instructed in history, in classical litera-

the title of Manichees. (See the Doway Bible on Gen. iv. 7.)

To these Romish Doctors I leave a Romish Doc-

ture, and philosophy, can choose nothing better than a course of Protestant theology."—Ibid. pp. 307, 308.—Such are the observations, contained in a work, which has been distinguished by a prize, conferred by the National Institute of France.

Perhaps, one of the most decisive proofs of the justice of this writer's remarks on the state of sacred literature in the Romish Church, has been supplied by the late re-publication, in this country, of that wretched specimen of Scripture criticism, Ward's Errata. This powerless offspring of a feeble parent, which was supposed to have perished when it first saw the light above a century ago, has lately upon signs of reanimation, been hailed in Ireland with shouts of joy. And the meagre abstract of Gregory Martin's Discovery of the manifold corruptions of the Holy Scriptures, a work which has itself lain for two hundred years overwhelmed by confutation, has been received by the Romanists of this part of the Empire, with a gratulation that might well become the darkest ages of the Church. A work, condemning the Protestant translation of the Bible for using the term *messenger* instead of *angel*, (in Mal. ii. 7. iii. 1. Mat. xi. 10. Luke vii. 27, &c.) by which the character of *angel* is withdrawn from the *priesthood*, and of a *sacrament* from *orders*:—for not rendering the words (in Hebr. xi. 21.) προσκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγκύρῃ τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ, as the Rhemish does, *adored the top of his rod*, and thereby surreptitiously removing one of the principal Scripture arguments for *image worship*:—for ascribing to the word *לִבַּע*, in the second commandment, the meaning *graven image*, whilst the Rhemish renders it *graven thing*, which, with those who admit an *image* not to be a *thing*, will exempt *images* from the prohibition of the commandment:—for not giving to the words μετανοία and *penitentia*, the sense of *penance*, but merely assigning to them their true interpretation, *repentance*, and thus doing wilful despite to the *sacrament of penance*:—a work, I say, condemning the Protestant translations of the Bible for these, and some other *such* errors; and in all cases *demonstrating* the error by one and the same irrefragable proof,—that the Romish version is the true one, and that the Protestant version which differs from it must *consequently* be false,—is certainly not such a one, as might, in the nineteenth century, be expected to be raked up by the clergy of a widely extended communion, and exhibited triumphantly as a master-piece of critical erudition. In the opinion of many, this miserable performance did not deserve an

tor to reply. Dr. Geddes, in his *Critical Remarks*, pp. 54, 55. has endeavoured to shew that Jerome's version, or that of the Vulgate, cannot be maintained. He has not, however, adduced the arguments which bear most strongly against their interpretation; namely, those which apply to the mistranslation of the concluding clause of the seventh verse, and to the violence offered even to that mistranslation in pronouncing that Cain having sinned should acquire dominion over his sinful desires, which is as much as to say that by yielding to sin a man acquires the power of controlling it. But too much has been said upon Romish exposition.*

answer; especially as every argument, which it contained, had been in former times repeatedly confuted. Perhaps however they judged more rightly, who thought, that even the weakest reasonings should be exposed lest they might be imagined to be strong, and that even the most hacknied arguments should be replied to lest they might be conceived to be new. Accordingly, this work received an answer from Dr. Ryan, whose zealous exertions in the cause of religious truth are well known, and is about to receive another from the Rev. Richard Grier of Middleton. These gentlemen, at all events, display courage in their enterprise, since the author whom they attack, backed by the whole council of Trent, has pronounced, that whoever shall not receive the books of Scripture, *as they are read in the Catholic (Romish) Church, and as they are in the Vulgate Latin edition, shall be ACCURSED.* Errata, p. 37.

Mr. Grier's work has been published since the date of the above observation in the last edition of this work: and, by the ability with which it has been executed, seems to have completely silenced the battery which had been just opened upon the received English translation of the Scriptures.

* How little entitled the orthodox member of the *Romish* church is, at this day, to expect serious consideration in the walks of sacred criticism, may be inferred (in addition to what has been said in the last note) from the description given of him by a Doctor of his own communion. "The vulgar papist rests his faith on the supposed infallibility of his church, although he knows not where that infallibility is lodged, nor in what it properly consists: it is to him a general, vague, indefinite

I come now to the translation by Theodotion, which, as it appears to me, does perfect justice to the original, and with which the version which I

idea, which he never thinks of analysing. He reads in his catechism, or is told by his catechist, that *the Church cannot err in what she teaches*; and then he is told, that this unerring church is composed only of those who hold communion with the Bishop of Rome, and precisely believe as he, and the bishops who are in communion with him, believe. From that moment reason is set aside; authority usurps its place, and implicit faith is the necessary consequence. He dares not even advance to the first step of Des Cartes's logic; he dares not doubt: for in his table of sins, which he is obliged to confess, he finds *doubting in matters of faith* to be a grievous crime." Such is Dr. Geddes's account of him whom he is pleased to call *the vulgar papist*; under which title he in truth means to include, all who are sincere votaries of the Church of Rome, and whom that church would acknowledge as such: in other words he means by this term to designate all who are actually within the pale of Popery.

And let it not be supposed that this is the testimony of an enemy in the disguise of a friend; and that the author, whilst he assumed the name of *Catholic*, was influenced by the feelings of a Protestant. On the contrary it is manifest from the following passage that his mind remained under the powerful influence of Romish impression, and that he continued still a partizan of that faith whose errors he affected to decry. For, says he, "Is the faith of the vulgar Protestant better founded? He rests it on a book called the Holy Bible, which he believes to be the infallible word of God."—And thus he pronounces the faith of the Protestant and of the Papist to be alike implicit and alike unfounded. "If the instructor of the Protestant be asked how he knows that the book which he puts into the hand of his catechumen is the infallible word of God; he cannot like the Priest, appeal to an unerring church; he acknowledges no such guide: and yet it is hard to conceive what other better argument he can use."—He goes on even to pronounce, that "in the Popish controversy, the Romanists have on this point, the better side of the question; called, by some of their controversialists, *the question of questions*." And in what way does their superiority appear upon this question of questions? By "its never having been satisfactorily solved by the Romanists themselves: they having always reasoned in what is termed a vicious circle; proving the infallibility of the Church from the authority of Scripture, and the authority of Scripture from the Church's infallibility." (Pre-

have proposed entirely coincides. Ουκ, αν αγαθως ποιης, δεκτον· και αν μη αγαθως ποιης, επι θυρας αμαρτια εγκαθηται· και προς σε ορμη αυτου, και αρξεις αυτου. Here is an agreement in all its parts with the rendering which has been submitted; the force of αμαρτια, like that of אָמָרְטָה, extending to the *sin-offering*; εγκαθηται, as well as קָרַב, denoting the *posture of an animal*; and αυτου the masculine decidedly marking, that the reference in the last clause was, not to αμαρτια* but, to Abel. See Theodot. apud Montefalc.

Grotius has given the passage somewhat of a different turn, and yet departs but little from the meaning which has been here assigned. He considers the force of the *si bene egeris*, as carried down to the concluding clause, so as to make the sense this, “if thou doest well, Abel as the younger shall be rendered subject to thy authority.” And so makes the clause beginning with, “If thou doest not well,” &c. parenthetical; of which, he says, innumerable instances are to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures. This mode of translating the passage has been adopted by Purver in his English version; and is certainly not unworthy of commendation. At the same time, I cannot but think the view of the sentence, which I have offered to the reader, more grammatical, more consistent, and more natural.†

face to Critical Remarks, p. v.) This must undoubtedly have given the Romanists *the better side of the question*; for what Protestant logician could successfully reply to such an argument? But the reader must be wearied of this fatuity.

* That is, to αμαρτια, in the sense of *sin*; in which sense alone it is, that it has been by some made the subject of reference, in opposition to Abel. In the sense of *sin-offering*, it would, as we have seen, admit the *masculine* pronoun αυτου; but to the word, taken in that sense, the reference of the pronoun would have no meaning.

† The note of Ludov. de Dieu on this passage deserves to be noticed. “*An non, sive bene offeras, sive non bene, ad ostium*

NO. LXVI.—ON THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE SACRIFICE
OF ABEL AND THAT OF CHRIST.

PAGE 43. (*v*)—Dr. Richie judiciously observes, on this passage of Hebrews, “that it makes the sacrifice of Abel to have been of the *piacular* kind, by the comparison which it makes between the effect of it and that of the sacrifice of Christ, which without doubt *was* of the *piacular* kind. For, unless these two sacrifices had been of the same kind, and productive of similar effects, such a comparison could not have been made, nor the *effect* of the one pronounced to have been better, or much greater, than the *effect* of the other: causes of a different nature producing effects of a dissimilar kind: and between effects of a dissimilar kind, no such comparison as that here made being admissible.” Peculiar doctrines of Revelation. Part II. §. xlii. p. 138.

NO. LXVII.—ON THE NATURE OF SACRIFICE *BEFORE THE
LAW*: TENDING TO SHEW ITS CONFINEMENT TO *ANIMAL
SACRIFICE*, EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF CAIN.

PAGE 44. (*w*)—From the time of Abel’s sacrifice *peccatum cubat*? Quum scilicet, indigne ferret Cain, fratris sacrificium suo esse prælatum, quod non minus recte sacrificiorum ritus observasset fratre, neque quicquam, sive quoad rem oblatam, sive quoad externam offerendi rationem ac ceremoniam, dignius a fratre ac melius prolectum esset, monet Deus, non esse hic ipsam oblationem respiciendam, recte ne ea secundum legem scilicet ceremonialem facta sit, an secus: sed personam offerentem, dedita ne ea sit peccato, an non. Tu peccatum perpetuo circumfers, illudque in procinctu habes, cubans quippe ante fores: itaque nihil refert, bene ne an male secundum rites legales offeras. Vel optima tua oblatio a peccato vitiatur. Non debebat appetitus tuus ferri ad peccatum, sed peccati appetitus ad te, sicut mulieris appetitus ad maritum cui subest, tuque ei dominari.—Posset etiam verti, *An non sive pulchrum quid adferas, sive non pulchrum*, &c.—Animadv. in Vet. Test. p. 18.—These interpretations possess much ingenuity: but are liable to the grammatical objection already urged, of taking *peccatum*, in the sense of *sin*, in the masculine gender.

to the giving of the law, we find the sacrificial offering described by no other appellation than that of חלה or זבח, the *holocaust* or burnt-offering, and the *Zebach* or immolated victim. Thus we see the former expression used of the sacrifice of Noah in Gen. viii. 20. and again repeatedly applied to the sacrifice of Abraham in the xxiid chapter. It is also employed by Moses in speaking of sacrifices to Pharaoh, in Exod. x. 25, and again in describing the offerings of Jethro, xviii. 12. The oblations of Job likewise, (Job, i. 5.) and of his friends (xlii. 7, 8.) are so denominated: as are those of Balaam, in the xxiid ch. of Numbers. In the numerous other instances of the mode of worship by sacrifice, which occur in this early period, the expression used is either זבח, or, where the *sort* of sacrifice is not exactly specified, a word immediately derived from and clearly implying it, מזבח, which though translated generally by us an *Altar*, and being sometimes applied to that on which *Incense* was presented, cannot, as Sykes remarks, (Essay, p. 246.) when used absolutely, and in its strict sense, be otherwise understood, than as signifying “that on which *slain animals* were offered.”

Doctor Richie, indeed, not only maintains that none but *animal sacrifices* were offered from the time of Cain to the promulgation of the law, but that all during that period were none other than *holocausts*, or *burnt-offerings*; the *Zebach*, or slain animal, having been uniformly offered up in that manner: and that consequently *all* the sacrifices of this early period were *piacular*. In this last position Sykes concurs, so far as to allow, that “all holocausts before the days of Moses were *deprecations* of wrath,” and he admits also, that from the time of Abel until that of Jacob, there is no instance

of any other sacrifice than the *burnt-offering*. But from his peculiar notions concerning the nature of sacrifice he is led to contend, that the sacrifice of Jacob, and those of Moses and Jethro included a *peace-offering*, although he confesses, that in no one instance is there any mention expressly made of *peace-offerings* before the law.

The circumstances, on which Sykes grounds his opinion, are—1. the introduction of the word זבח: which is of no weight, because nothing prevents the *Zebach* from having been an *holocaust*.—2. the mention of the *eating of Bread* at the time of the sacrifice: from which no inference can be drawn respecting the nature of the sacrifice, as we have already seen in Number XLIX.—and 3. the mention of both the *Zebach* and the *Holocaust*, in the cases of Moses and Jethro, in Exod. x. 25. and xviii. 12: to which Richie has satisfactorily replied, by shewing that the particle ו, is to be taken, not in the sense of *and*, but in that of *even*. Indeed Dr. Richie deserves particularly to be consulted on the whole of this subject. See Pecul. Doctr. Part II. §. 42—49. vol. i. p. 137—144. See also Sykes's Essay, p. 231—251; where, if allowance be made for the author's peculiar bias on the subject of sacrifice, considerable support will be found for the principal part of Dr. Richie's positions. But whether Dr. Richie be well founded or not in his opinion, that *all* the oblations prior to the law, excepting that of Cain, were *holocausts*; this at least *must* be admitted, that they were *animal sacrifices*; more than which, the present argument does not require.

Josephus, it is to be observed, expressly describes the holocaust offered by Noah, as a sacrifice of deprecation. He states that this Patriarch, under a persuasion that God had doomed mankind to de-

struction, and through terror of the repetition of the dreadful judgment he had so lately witnessed, offered up prayers and sacrifices to God, to *turn away his wrath*. Antiq. Jud. Lib. I. cap. iv. This testimony of the Jewish Historian, as to the received notions of the nature of sacrifice in his day, the reader will please to add to those which have been adduced in Number XXXIII, in reply to Dr. Priestley's remarks upon that head. It will most naturally fall in at p. 213. vol. i.

NO. LXVIII.—ON THE DISPROPORTION BETWEEN THE EFFECTS
OF THE MOSAIC AND THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICES.

PAGE 48. (x)—On this subject particular attention should be paid to the observations in Numbers XXXI. XXXIV. XXXVI. and XXXVII. ; especially to those contained in pp. 193, 194, and p. 265—267. of the first volume.

The following elucidation by the learned Grotius, whose unbiassed reflexions are always valuable, deserves to be noticed.—*Lex vetus dupliciter spectatur: aut carnaliter, aut spiritualiter. Carnaliter, quâ instrumentum fuit πολιτειας, reipublicæ Judaicæ. Spiritualiter, quâ σκιν εἶχε των μελλοντων, umbram habebat futurorum.* Hebr. x. 1. Quod ad priorem considerationem attinet, sacrificia Legis expiatoria sanctificabant ad carnis puritatem, Hebr. ix. 1.—Deus enim Rex Hebræorum (quoniam Legislatori licet suam legem, præsertim pœnalem, nonnihil relaxare) in *quibusdam* delictis victimas expiatorias admisit vice ipsius peccatoris, et per illas ac non aliter peccatorem a mortis pœna (quæ juxta carnalem sensum erat sanctio Legis) liberare voluit.—In *quibusdam* ergo delictis; quod ad pœnam carnalem attinebat, admittebatur placamen, redemptio, satisfactio, compensatio denique mortis bestię

cum morte hominis alioque debitâ.—Victimæ pro peccato ita in Veteri Fœdere peccata expiarentur; nimirum Deum movendo, ut pœnam carnalem remitteret, idque per satisfactionem quandam.

Quod autem typi præstiterunt carnaliter, hoc ο αντιτυπος, *exemplar*, Christus præstat spiritualiter; et quod typi in quibusdam duntaxat delictis, id Christus in omnibus, Deum scilicet movendo, ut spirituales pœnam remittat, idque per satisfactionem perfectissimam. Plus enim, non minus semper est in re typo designatâ, quam in typo, ut ratio monstrat. Commune est sacrificio expiatorio legali et sacrificio Christi illud, quod sine sanguinis effusione non fit remissio, Hebr. ix. 22. Hanc impetrationem remissionis per sanguinem ibidem divinus scriptor appellat modo αγιασμον, *sanctificationem* (13.) modo καθαρισμον, *expiationem*, (14, 22, 23.) Sed in Veteri Lege victimæ erant pecudes, (12,) in hac nostrâ Christus ipse non sacerdos tantum sed est victima (14, 26.) Legalis illa expiatio hujus cœlestis sive spiritualis υποδειγμα (23,) et αντιτυπον,* *exemplar* (24,) quomodo? Quia illa præstabat carni munditiem (14,) id est, reatus ablationem, non autem spiritui sive conscientiæ (9,) hæc autem ipsi conscientiæ (14.) Quia quod in Veteri Lege erat mors temporalis, hoc in Novo Fœdere est mors æterna, Hebr. x. 29; ac proinde illic liberatio erat temporalis, hic vero αιωνιος λυτρωσις, *æterna redemptio*, Hebr. ix. 12. Quare sicut eodem loco ab effectu legalis victimæ ad effectum hujus per spiritum oblatae argumentum producitur, *Quanto magis*, &c. sic et nobis licet hunc in modum certissime argumentari, *Victima legalis reatum carnalem sustulit, Deum movendo ad remis-*

* Grotius has here used the word *antitype* improperly, and in a sense directly opposite to that in which he has just before properly applied the term.

sionem ; ergo multo magis reatum spiritualem, Deum itidem ad remissionem movendo, tollit oblata per spiritum victima.—Grotii Opera Theolog. tom. iv. pp. 331—333.

The principles from which Grotius has derived his conclusion are manifestly these. 1. That the expiation wrought by the sacrifices under the Law were typical of that effected by the death of Christ: 2. That in every type there must be something of the same general nature with that which is contained in the thing typified: and 3. That combined with this general correspondence between the type and the thing prefigured, there should exist that disproportion which might be expected between the shadow and the substance.

These principles indeed are so clearly and unequivocally laid down by the apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews, that even the great fathers of the Socinian school, Faustus Socinus and Crellius, admit their evidence, and differ from Grotius only in the application. In establishing the *correspondence*, and the *disproportion*, of the Mosaic and the Christian expiation, they urge the reasoning of the apostle no less forcibly than Grotius has done; as may be seen in the treatise of Socinus *De Jes. Christ. Serv.* (Opera, tom. ii. pp. 157, 158.) and in Crellius's *Respons. ad Grot.* (Opera, tom. i. p. 204—211.) These expositors, not having been initiated into the convenient artifice, so familiar to their followers, of rejecting the authority of an apostle when it made against them, found themselves compelled by the plain language of scripture to acknowledge the validity of these principles.

The nature of their system, however, being at variance with their admission, they were led to strain one principle to an extreme, subversive of the other; and by urging *disproportion* within the con-

finer of *dissimilitude*, they were enabled to escape the bearings of that *correspondence* of the two dispensations, which forms the foundation of the apostle's argument, and for which they had themselves in the first instance strenuously contended. For whilst in professing to represent the expiation by the sacrifice of Christ as of a superior order to that effected by the sacrifices of the law, they endeavour to establish this by such a description of its nature, as divests it of every character which the Mosaic sacrifice possessed, they in truth shew, that the death of Christ bore no relation whatever to those sacrifices by which they admit it to have been typified: that is in other words, they make the Mosaic sacrifices at the same time typical and not typical of the death of Christ.—See this point well treated, though in a different manner, by Stillingfleet, in his *Discourse concerning the true Reasons, &c.* p. 365—367.

On another fallacy in the reasoning of the above writers it is also necessary to remark. Whilst they profess faithfully to follow the apostle's reasoning in his address to the Hebrews, they represent the expiation of the legal sacrifice as wholly typical; whereas it was not less real and effectual under its own proper system, than the sacrifice of Christ was under that by which it was succeeded; whilst at the same time it prefigured that more important expiation, which was to be introduced under the new dispensation; all the parts of which, the apostle distinctly informs us, had their corresponding circumstances in that which went before.

Upon the whole then briefly to sum up the present subject. The people of the Jews being placed under a peculiar polity, whereby they stood at the same time in a civil and ritual relation to their divine governor; their offences in these several re-

lations exposed them to the inflictions appropriate to each. The mercy of the Legislator at the same time provided for them the means of expiation by sacrifice, whereby, in certain cases, the corporal punishment incurred by the violation of the civil law, and the legal impurities contracted by the neglect of the ritual institutions, might be done away. The entire system, however, being but preparatory for another by which it was to be superseded, was constituted in all its essential parts in such a manner as to be emblematical of that which it was intended to introduce : and the several parts of the one consequently adjusted by the same proportions which were to obtain in the other.

Hence it follows, that the sacrifices under the temporal and ceremonial dispensation of the Law had a real efficacy in releasing those who were subjected to it from its temporal penalties and ceremonial disqualifications ; in like manner as the one great sacrifice under the Gospel possesses the power to release mankind at large from the everlasting penalties of that spiritual law under which all men are bound, and to cleanse the conscience from those moral impurities which forbid all access to that holy Being, who is to be worshipped only in spirit and in truth. The expiation then, under the old law, was no less real than that which it prefigured under the new, whilst it bore to the dispensation, of which it was a part, the same proportion which that more perfect expiation by the death of Christ bears to the more perfect dispensation to which it appertains. The wisdom of the divine contrivance, in this as in the other branches of providential arrangement, rendering that which was complete and effectual for its own immediate purpose, at the same time introductory and subservient to other and more important objects.

Berryman, in treating of the typical interpretation of the Law, although leaning a little too much to the notion of its being merely symbolical, places the parallelism and proportion of the two dispensations in a just and satisfactory light. "From what" (he asks) "was the offender delivered by the legal sacrifices? Was it not from the temporal death, and the danger of being cut off from the congregation? And to what privilege was he restored or entitled? Was it not to the privilege of appearing before God, and joining in the public worship? What was the purifying or sanctification consequent upon such atonements? Was it not (as the apostle styles it) *the purifying of the flesh*; an outward and a transient efficacy, which could not reach to *purge their consciences from dead works*? And why was all this necessary to be often repeated, but because it had no solid or permanent effect, nor deserved to find acceptance of itself? But if we take it in a symbolical or typical point of view, then it leads us to acknowledge the benefit of Christ's redemption, and those invaluable privileges he has purchased for us. That temporal death, which was denounced by the Law, will denote that everlasting punishment to which sinners are exposed as such. The legal impurity, which wanted to be cleansed, will denote the defilement and impurity of sin. The outward admission to the service of the temple, will denote our spiritual privilege of access unto God, as well in the present ordinances of his church, as in the future inheritance of his eternal kingdom. And all this being performed by the oblation of *sacrifices*, clean and perfect in their kind, will import our being *redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot; who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, for a sweet-smelling*

savour, and entered not into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, that true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man, there to plead the merit of his sacrifice, and make for ever intercession for us,—Boyle Lecture Sermons, vol. iii. pp. 776, 777.

On the subject of this Number in general, there are some excellent remarks of Bishop Stillingfleet, to be found in his “Discourse concerning the true reasons,” &c. p. 315—318.

NO. LXIX.—ON THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE SACRIFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THAT EMPLOYED IN THE NEW TO DESCRIBE REDEMPTION BY THE DEATH OF CHRIST : AND THE ORIGINAL ADAPTATION OF THE FORMER TO THE SUBJECT OF THE LATTER.

PAGE 49. (*y*)—If indeed it be considered, that the sacrifice of Christ was the great object held in view in the appointment of all preceding sacrifices, and that *these* were primarily designed as sacramental representations of *that*, it will follow, that in reference to *it* must the sacrificial terms have been originally framed : and that therefore, when applied by the Apostles to the death of Christ, they were adopted not merely as being familiar to the Jews from their application to the sin-offerings under the law, but because of their original adaptation to this *one great* sacrifice, in *consequence* of which they had been applied to the legal sacrifices ordained to represent it. For some valuable observations on this subject, see Holmes’s Four Tracts, pp. 102, 103.

If this view of the matter be just, it then follows, that so far were the writers of the New Testament from employing the sacrificial terms in mere accommodation to Jewish notions, (an argument much insisted on by Dr. Priestley, H. Taylor, and others, see pp. 24, 25, and p. 192—194, of the first volume)

that they must have used them as *primarily* belonging to the death of Christ, and as in strict accuracy more aptly characterizing the Christian sacrifice, than those sacrifices of typical import to which they had been applied under the law. From this also it might be expected, that a *fuller* light would now be thrown upon the nature of the Jewish sacrifice; and the true force and value of the sacrificial ceremonies and phrases, more perfectly understood. And this we find to be the case; the language of the New Testament on the subject of atonement being more precise and significant than that of the old. Instances of this may be seen in pp. 271. 300, 301, of the first volume, and are not denied by the opponents of the doctrine of Atonement, as it has been already observed in the places referred to. Thus then we find the Old Testament, and the New, bestowing mutual elucidation, on this head: the rites and terms of sacrifice in the Old, exemplifying and describing the leading principles and fundamental notions of atonement; and the more exact and perfect delineation of it in the New, filling up the outline, and exhibiting the great work of our Redemption, in its genuine magnitude and beauty.

The train of reflexion pursued in this Number, leads me naturally to notice the opinions of Archbishop Tillotson, as connected with its subject. Nor is it without much regret, that I find myself compelled to notice, for the express purpose of marking with condemnation, the opinions of a prelate, whose great talents and virtues have combined to shed so bright a lustre on the annals of the English church. This distinguished writer,* hav-

* So highly was Tillotson esteemed as a *writer* by the celebrated Locke, that, in his treatise Concerning reading and stu-

ing been forcibly impressed with the many visible traces of the doctrines and truths of revelation discoverable in the mythology and worship of the Heathen world, was led to conclude, with a rashness little to be expected from such a man, that the Christian religion, whilst it was in its substance a most perfect institution, was yet, in condescension to the weakness of mankind, accommodated to the existing prejudices of the world, so far as was consistent with the honour of God, and its own great and valuable purposes. And accordingly he maintains, that the doctrine of our redemption by the sacrifice of Christ, had its origin in the notion of sacrifices entertained amongst the Pagans.

"This notion" (he says) "of the expiation of sin, by sacrifices of one kind or other, seems to have

dy for a gentleman, he specifically recommends the constant perusal of the works of that prelate, as a most useful exercise for the student who is desirous to acquire the talent of *perspicuity*. So very highly, indeed, did that most excellent judge of whatever is requisite to clearness of expression, rate the archbishop's endowments in this particular, that he has joined with him but one other writer in the English language, as exhibiting a just model for the acquisition of a perspicuous style. That writer is *Chillingworth*, whom he commends also for attainments of yet higher value.—"Besides perspicuity" (he says) "there must be also right reasoning; without which, perspicuity serves but to expose the speaker. And for the attaining of this, I should propose the constant reading of *Chillingworth*, who, by his example, will teach both perspicuity and the way of right reasoning, *better than any book that I know*; and therefore will deserve to be read upon that account *over and over again*; not to say any thing of his argument."—Locke's Works, vol. iv. p. 601.

Why I have so readily availed myself of the opportunity, afforded by this honourable testimony, of presenting *Chillingworth* to the more immediate notice of the student, at *this* period, and in *this* country, will not be difficult, upon reflexion, to discover.—Quære—Are Tillotson, and Chillingworth, and writers of that manly stamp, those, with whom the youth of the present day are most solicitous to converse, for the improvement of their reasoning and their style?

obtained very early in the world; and, among all other ways of divine worship, to have found the most universal reception in all times and places. And indeed a great part of the Jewish religion and worship, was a plain condescension to the general apprehensions of men, concerning this way of appeasing the Deity by sacrifice: and the greatest part of the Pagan religion and worship, was likewise founded upon the same notion and opinion, which, because it was so universal, seems to have had its original from the first parents of mankind, either immediately after the Creation, or after the Flood; and from thence, I mean as to the substance of this notion, to have been derived and propagated to all their posterity. And with this general notion of mankind, whatever the ground or foundation of it might be, God was pleased so far to comply, as once for all to have a general atonement made for the sins of all mankind, by the sacrifice of his only Son."—Tillotson's works, vol. i. p. 440. For similar observations, see do. pp. 439. 446, 447. 451. And again in vol. ii. p. 112, he states the matter thus:—that "with these notions, which had generally possessed mankind, God was pleased to comply so far, as, in the frame of the Jewish religion, (which was designed for a type of the more perfect institution of the Christian religion, and a preparation for it) to appoint sacrifices to be slain and offered up for the sinner," &c. and that afterwards, in the dispensation of the Gospel, the same condescension to the apprehensions of mankind was likewise observed, as has been already stated.

Now it is surely much to be lamented, that when this learned Prelate had, upon a full examination of the case, been led to discover such a striking conformity between Paganism and Christianity, as must reduce the matter to this alternative, either

that the Christian dispensation was framed in compliance with Heathen prejudices, or that Paganism was a corruption of those oracles which conveyed anticipations of the Christian scheme: it is much, I say, to be lamented, that he should have been drawn into a conclusion, so directly at variance with history and scripture, when one so powerfully sustained by both was immediately at hand.

The stumbling block to the Archbishop, as an ingenious writer has justly remarked, was the supposition of a *Religion of Nature*,* prior to and inde-

* One of the most singular theories ever devised on the subject of *Natural Religion*, is that of Bishop Warburton; which I subjoin here the more readily, as it tends to shew to what strange conceits even the greatest men may be carried, when they attempt to be wise beyond what is written, and presume to substitute their own conjectural reasonings for the solid truths of revelation.—Man, he contends, was created mortal, in the immaterial as well as the material part of his nature, immateriality simply being common to him with the whole animal creation. But by God's breathing into his nostrils the *breath of life*, and thereby making him a *living soul*, the *life* in man was discriminated from the *life* in brutes; since by this act was communicated to his immaterial part a *rational* principle, which, by making him responsible for his actions, must require, according to the existing constitution of things, a *continuance of life*, and consequently a distinct existence of the soul after its separation from the body. In the state, in which, according to the Bishop, the first couple were placed previous to their admission into Paradise, they were subject only to the law of *Natural Religion*, the constituent parts of which religion were discoverable by the efforts of the human understanding unassisted by divine instruction. On being advanced to the *Paradisiacal* state, man became the subject of *Revealed Religion*; and as the reward of his obedience to the positive precept attached to his new condition, *immortality* (meaning thereby the perpetual duration and uninterrupted union of the body and soul) a quality which was altogether extraneous to his original nature, was placed within his reach by the *free grace* of God. The opportunity now afforded to him of exalting his nature by the superinduced blessings of immortality, was lost by his non-compliance with the condition: and at the same time the corruption, which his disobedience caused to that rational

pendent of Revelation. Hence arose the assumption, that the notion of expiation for sins by sacrifice, which he found so early and so universal, was

nature in which he had been made to resemble the divine image, degraded him to his first condition of mortality, and made him again liable to that total death, that complete annihilation to which his frame was originally subject. But by the intervention of Jesus Christ, man was not only restored to the advantages of his original state, namely the continuance of the soul after the dissolution of the body; but he was also enabled to obtain that immortality, which Adam by his obedience might have secured; with this difference however, that, in the immortality procured by Christ, death is permitted to give a temporary interruption to that existence and union of the soul and body, which, in the other case, would have been unbroken. But not only had the transgression occasioned a relapse into that state of mortality in which man had been originally created, but it also threw him back into that subjection to natural Religion in which he was at first placed. In this dispensation of *Natural Religion*, which, according to Bishop Warburton, was thus permitted to precede the dispensation of *Grace*, the aids and succours of virtue were not, however, according to his hypothesis, wanting; for, in his view of the subject, the light of revelation is by no means required to make known the efficacy of repentance, or the rewards of upright conduct. Both these points, he contends, are evidently manifest to the eye of reason, tracing the connexion that must subsist between the creature and his Maker. Such are the paradoxical, and, it must be added, unscriptural sentiments, conveyed by this learned writer in the IXth book of the *Divine Legation*. They will be found well, though briefly, treated by Mr. Pearson, in the first three sections of his *Critical Essay*; a work, of which I have already had occasion to speak, in p. 73, and p. 393 of the former volume. Dr. Graves, also, in the 4th section, part III. of his *Lectures on the Pentateuch*, has made many valuable remarks, affecting, though not directly, these positions of the too ingenious Bishop.

It ought not to pass unnoticed, that his Lordship in one of his Letters to his friend Dr. Hurd, speaks of this his favourite theory, as intended "to confute the triumphant reasoning of unbelievers, particularly Tindal, who say redemption is a fable: for the only means of regaining God's *favour*, which they eternally confound with *immortality*, is that simple one which natural religion teaches, viz. *repentance*. To confute this, it was

the mere suggestion of human apprehensions ; not deduced from any express revelation concerning *the Lamb of God slain*, in decree and type, *from the foundation of the world* ; not springing from any divine institution, ordained for the purpose of shewing forth Christ's death, until he should himself appear in the flesh, to fulfil all that was prefigured of him, and to take away sin, and put an end to sacrifice, by the one great sacrifice of himself.

Had the Archbishop, as the same writer observes, reflected, that a religion or law of nature,* is a mere

necessary to shew, that restoration to a *free gift*, and the recovery of a *claim*, were two very different things. The common answer was, that natural religion does *not* teach reconciliation on repentance ; which if it does not, it teaches nothing, or worse than nothing." Of Natural Religion then, after all that Bishop Warburton has written about it, we have his full confession, that *if it does not teach the sufficiency of repentance, it teaches even worse than nothing*.—The opponent of the notion of Natural Religion, may safely allow the matter to rest upon the ground, on which the Bishop has placed it. That God will accept repentance in compensation for obedience, nothing short of the word of God can ever establish satisfactorily to any reasonable mind. The consequence of this position is supplied by the author of the Divine Legation.

* To him who would wish to see, how little the Religion of Nature, so far as it contains any thing truly valuable to man, is strictly entitled to that name, I would recommend the perusal of the preface to *The Religion of Jesus delineated*. The observations there contained, whilst they tend to shew, in animadverting upon *The Religion of Nature delineated*, how sadly deficient the scheme of natural religion is found, even at this day, although sketched by the hand of a master, and aided by the borrowed discoveries of revelation, at the same time clearly evince, that the promulger of the truths of what is called *natural religion*, in almost every case in which he advances any that are of importance to mankind, is in reality to be deemed, not *Αυτοδιδασκτος*, but *Θεοδιδασκτος*. Of this, however, the fullest and most complete proof is to be derived from the invaluable work of Dr. Ellis, in which he may be said to have demonstrated *The knowledge of Divine Things to be from Revelation, not from Reason or Nature*. Leland has also abundantly established the

ens rationis ; that the first parents of mankind were not left to the unassisted light of reason or nature, but were from the beginning fully instructed by their Creator, in all things necessary for them to know : that, after their fall, the way and method of their salvation was, in a certain degree, made known to them : that all religious rites flowed from the same divine source, viz. the original revelation

fact, of the total insufficiency of human reason in religious concerns, by the view, which he has given, of the state of religion in the Heathen world, in his work on The Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation. From Clark's 6th and 7th propp. of his Evidence of Natural and Revealed Religion, although this author is disposed to attribute to the powers of reason rather more than their due share, the same inference may be deduced—especially from what is said p. 659—665. and 666—671. vol. ii. of his works.—I should be guilty of injustice to an accomplished modern writer, if on this subject I permitted to pass unnoticed, Dr. Maltby's Thesis for his degree of B. D. contained in the volume of his Illustrations of the Truth of the Christian Religion. The following proposition, "*Nequit per se humana ratio cognitione satis plenâ et certâ assequi, quo potissimum modo Deus sit colendus ; quæ sint hominum officia ; vita denique futura sit, necne, æterna,*" is there treated with a justness, a succinctness, a good taste, a correctness of style, and a strength of authority, which reflect honour upon its author as a divine and as a scholar, and cannot fail to give satisfaction to the reader, who wishes to find the *substance* of what can be said upon this important question, compressed into the smallest compass, and in the best manner. The concluding observation, concerning such as at the present day repose on the sufficiency of reason for a knowledge of their duties, contains a truth, in which every reflecting mind must necessarily acquiesce. "*Profecto eâdem, quâ veteres philosophi, caligine animi eorum sunt mersi : aut si quid melius sapiunt, id omne a Christiana religione mala fide mutuati sunt.*" p. 355. And therefore, as the writer finally remarks, it is most devoutly to be desired, that the advocates for the all-sufficiency of reason, would deeply imprint upon their minds, this momentous maxim of the great Bacon—"Causa vero et radix fere omnium malorum in scientiis ea una est, quod dum mentis humanæ vires falso miramur et extollimus, vera ejus auxilia non quæramus." p. 359.

of the redemption of the world by the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ: that all the apprehensions and common prejudices of mankind, as they are called, were derived from the same fountain; that all, until the apostacy at Babel, had the same tongue, the same faith, the same Lord: that the Heathen carried off from thence the same religious rites and ceremonies, and the same sentiments concerning God and his ways with man, which by change of language, length of time, wantonness of imagination, perverseness of human nature, and subtlety of the devil, were reduced to that corrupted state of faith and practice in which our Saviour at his advent found them:—and that, as already observed, from the first promise made to Adam, during the patriarchal and legal dispensations, all was Christianity in type and figure; so that Christianity was the *first* religion in the world, corrupted afterwards indeed by the Gentile, but preserved by the Jew in type, till Christ, the great antitype, the reality and completion, came:—had he (this writer observes) pursued this train of thinking, he would have found the reverse of his conclusion to be the truth; namely, “that Christianity was not instituted in compliance with Paganism, but that Paganism was nothing else but the great truths of Christianity split and debased into a legend of fables, such as we meet with in their mythology.”*—Speerman’s Letters to a friend concerning the Septuagint translation and the Heathen Mythology, pp. 150, 151.

“The writer, who has made the above observations, and whose reasonings would not have been

* If this view of the case be a just one, we certainly might reasonably expect to find in the mythology of the ancients, in a much larger and more important sense, what Plutarch says of the Egyptian fables, *αμυδρας τιναις εμφανεις της αληθειας*, *some faint and obscure resemblance of the truth*.

less valuable had they taken less tincture from the Hutchinsonian school. has endeavoured, and not without success, to establish the point last adverted to, namely the derivation of the Pagan mythology from the divine revelations.

Tillotson's idea corresponds with that which was afterwards adopted by Spencer. For since he admits the Jewish dispensation to have been typical of the Christian, the accommodation of the Christian scheme to Pagan prejudices, for which he contends, could only have been effected through the previous accommodation of the Jewish scheme to those prejudices; which, as we have seen in Number XLVII, falls in with the theory maintained by Spencer. And this theory, as we have seen in the same Number, p. 375 of the first vol. is satisfactorily refuted by Shuckford, whose work on *The Sacred and Prophane History of the World Connected*, goes to Establish the direct contradictory of Spencer's position.* The arguments of Spencer are also successfully combated by Witsius in his *Ægyptiaca*: see likewise the same author's *Misc. Sacr. Lib. I. Diss. i. p. 429—437*. Warburton confesses truly, that Spencer's work is but a paraphrase and comment on the third book of the *Moreh Nevochim* of Rabbi Maimonides: and joining forces with Spencer† in maintaining the orthodoxy of the philoso-

* The particular application of his arguments to Spencer's notion will be found briefly sketched in vol. i. p. 313—317.

† How little Spencer deserved to have the support of Warburton, is not only manifest, from the whole scheme of his argument, in his great work *De legibus Hebræorum*, which is itself unsupported by true history, and has always been resorted to by Infidel writers in order to wing their shafts more effectively against the Mosaic Revelation; but may also be made to appear, more evidently and briefly, by the quotation of a single passage from this writer's *Discourse concerning Prodigious*. "It is," he says, "the nature of the soul to be greatly impressive to a per-

phizing Jew,* he contends with all his might, against the arguments of Witsius and Shuckford.—Div. Leg. Book IV. Sect. 6. To this he was urged by

suasion of *parallels, equalities, similitudes*, in the frame and government of the world.—This general temper of the soul easily inclines it to believe great and mighty changes in states, ushered with the solemnity of some mighty and analogous changes in nature; and that all terrible evils are prefaced or attended with some prodigious and amazing alterations in the creation: Hence perhaps it is, that we generally find great troubles and judgments on earth described, especially by persons, *ecstatical, prophets and poets*, (whose speeches usually rather follow the *easy sense of the soul than the rigid truth of things*;) by all the examples of horror and confusion in the frame of the creation: The Prophet David describes God's going forth to judgment thus: *The earth shook and trembled, the foundations also of the hills moved and were shaken,*" &c. (p. 70—72.)—Now can it be any defence against this irreverent attack upon the *prophets inspired by God*, which charges them with indulging in *enthusiastic visions and expressions founded only in their own fancies and not in the truth of things*; can it, I say, be deemed any defence to urge, as Warburton has done, that "through his intention to the argument, he often expresses himself very *crudely*?" (Div. Leg. vol. ii. p. 341.) If he be so *crude* in his expression, as to cast discredit upon revelation, whilst his intention is to support it, he must surely be a very unsafe guide in theology. At the same time, it can hardly be imagined, that an author, possessing considerable powers and facilities of language, could, in any case, especially in one affecting the very foundation of revealed religion, express himself so *crudely*, as to represent himself destitute of a belief, which he *firmly, habitually, and reverently* maintained. At all events, it is evident, that such a writer is to be consulted with much caution, and his authorities scanned with much suspicion.

* For a very curious and interesting account of the circumstances which gave rise to the production of the celebrated work, the *Moreh Nevochim*, in which Maimonides first gave to the world, the theory of the ceremonial institutions of the Jews here referred to, the reader may consult Warburton's Div. Leg. vol. ii. pp. 353, 354. He will probably however not be altogether satisfied, that the existing necessity of "shewing to the apostatizing Jews, that the Scriptures might be defended or even explained on the principles of Aristotle; and of gratifying the inquisitive and disputatious tendencies of those, who en-

the necessity which his paradoxical system had imposed upon him, of making out for the Egyptian rites and institutions an extravagant antiquity ; and, in defence of his dogmas, he advances every thing, that a powerful but perverted ingenuity, acting on a wide range of learning, could supply.*

quired after the *reasons* of the Jewish laws, by finding out a reasonableness and convenience in their ceremonial rites," supplies a proof, that those reasons, which the philosophic Jew had thus assigned, were the true reasons, which influenced the divine legislator in the several ordinances of his Law. The parallel, which Warburton here insinuates, between the nature of his own great work and that of Maimonides, will not escape the notice of the observing reader.

* The character of this distinguished scholar and divine, as it is portrayed by the hand of a master, I here willingly subjoin.—“ He was a man of vigorous faculties, a mind fervid and vehement, supplied by incessant and unlimited enquiry, with wonderful extent and variety of knowledge, which yet had not oppressed his imagination, nor clouded his perspicacity. To every work he brought a memory full fraught, with a fancy fertile of original combinations, and at once exerted the powers of the scholar, the reasoner, and the wit. But his knowledge was too multifarious to be always exact, and his pursuits were too eager to be always cautious. His abilities gave him a haughty confidence, which he disdained to conceal or mollify ; and his impatience of opposition disposed him to treat his adversaries with such contemptuous superiority as made his readers commonly his enemies, and excited against him the wishes of some who favoured his cause. He seems to have adopted the Roman emperor's determination, *oderint dum metuant* ; he used no allurements of gentle language, but wished to compel rather than persuade.—His style is copious without selection, and forcible without neatness : he took the words that presented themselves : his diction is coarse and impure, and his sentences are unmeasured.”—Johnson's Life of Pope.

For a view of the character more favourable, but not more just, I would refer to that which Bishop Hurd, the uniform admirer and panegyrist of Warburton, has given in the life he has written of that prelate. His encomiums, on The Divine Legation especially, are overcharged ; and the recollection that the cause of truth and of religion, no less than the reputation of his friend, was involved in the estimation of that important work, should have rendered his panegyric more qualified.

Lord Bolingbroke has seldom been found instrumental in correcting theological mistakes, and yet nothing can be more apposite in reply to these dangerous notions of Tillotson, Spencer, and Warburton, than his observations upon this very subject. For the weighty reasons assigned by these writers, he says, (alluding to such as held the opinions of Spencer)—“The God of truth chose to indulge error, and suited his institutions to the taste of the age: he contented himself also to take ordinary and natural means, in a case to which they were not adequate: and whilst miracles and divine interpo-

My friend Doctor Graves, in his late excellent work on the Pentateuch, has sketched a portrait, which for likeness of feature and justness of colouring, seems to me to merit a place in the neighbourhood of that which has been drawn by Johnson.—Speaking of the Divine Legation, and having observed, that “While its author lived, his splendid talents and extensive learning, raised in his followers and defenders such enthusiastic admiration, that they could not perceive, or at least would not allow, that he had been in the smallest point erroneous: while the keenness of his controversial asperity, the loftiness of his literary pretensions, and the paradoxical form in which he too frequently chose to clothe his opinions, roused in his answerers a zeal of opposition, which would sometimes yield him no credit for the discovery of any truth:” he then proceeds: “Time should now enable us to view him in his true light: in reasoning, sagacious yet precipitate; in criticism, ingenious but not unprejudiced; his comprehensive view sometimes embraced in the process of his enquiries too wide an extent; while his quick imagination sometimes led him to combine his arguments with too slight a connexion. But when he directed, to any one grand point, his undivided and unprejudiced attention, he frequently diffused over it the radiance of genius, and discovered the recesses of truth. Happy, had his humility been equal to his talents, and had his temper been as calm and tolerant, as his understanding was luminous and penetrating. His researches would then have been conducted with more caution and impartiality, would have produced more unexceptionable conclusions, and had been attended with happier success.” Dr. Graves’s Lectures on the Pentateuch, vol. ii. p. 209—211.

sitions were displayed in great abundance before the eyes of the Israelites, yet Moses, under the direction of the Almighty, chose to make use of superstitions which he did not want, and which defeated instead of securing his intent ; insomuch, that if the apostacies of the Israelites, after such manifestations of the one true God, can be any way accounted for, it must be by the effect of the very expedient which had been employed to prevent those apostacies." In short, he says, the whole plan of Providence seems to have been, "*to destroy idolatry by indulgence to the very superstitions out of which it grew.*"*—Bolingbroke's Phil. Works, vol. i. p. 313—319.

What the noble Sophist had intended with no better will to Revealed Religion itself, than to those of its advocates whom he professes to rebuke, I have, in this extract, taken such liberties in modifying, as will permit the argument to bear, only where truth would have directed it ; namely, upon those mistaken interpreters of revelation, who depart from the written word of God, to follow the guidance of their own fancies in explaining the grounds and motives of the divine dispensations. Such it is impossible not to pronounce Tillotson,

* On the same subject, this writer, in another place, thus pointedly, (though as his custom is, irreverently) expresses himself. In order to preserve the purity of his worship, the Deity is represented, as prescribing to the Israelites, a multitude of rites and ceremonies, founded in the superstitions of Egypt, from which they were to be weaned, and he succeeded accordingly. They were never weaned entirely from all these superstitions : and the great merit of the law of Moses was teaching the people to adore one God, much as the idolatrous nations adored several. This may be called sanctifying Pagan rites and ceremonies, in theological language : but it is profaning the pure worship of God, in the language of common sense.—Phil. Works, vol. v. p. 375.

Spencer, and Warburton, to have been on the particular subject now before us.

In how very different a manner we ought to pursue our enquiries, from that which these writers would propose, I have already endeavoured to enforce, p. 35—48, of vol. i. also Number XLVII. and pp. 46, 47. 53, 54 of this volume. And how fully we are justified in so doing, will yet more satisfactorily appear, on consulting Dr. Graves's Lectures on the Pentateuch (especially the two sections of Lecture vi. part iii.) and the Eight Discourses on the Connexion between the Old and New Testament; in which latter work, the unity of the scheme of Redemption pervading the entire series of the divine dispensations, has been treated with much ability by Archdeacon Daubeny: whose opinions, upon so many important points, I am happy to find perfectly coincident with those, which I have submitted to the public, throughout these pages, on the nature of the atonement.

To such as may be desirous to investigate more deeply, the opinions of the three distinguished writers against whom I have found it necessary to contend in discussing the subject of the present Number, I recommend an attentive perusal of the tenth book of Eusebius's *Præparatio Evangelica*:—Book III. chap. v. of Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacræ*:—Bochart's *Geographia Sacra*:—Witsius's *Ægyptiaca*:—Winder's *History of Knowledge*:—Ellis's *Knowledge of Divine Things from Revelation* (especially p. 122—129:) Nichols's *Conference with a Theist*, (particularly vol. i. p. 290—308, and pp. 319, 320.) Faber's *Horæ Mosaicæ*: and Dr. Woodward's *Discourse on the Ancient Egyptians*,* (*Archæolog.* vol.

* An extract from this discourse I here subjoin, as particularly worthy of attention, in reply to the favourite theory of

iv.) The Bishop of Lincoln, in his excellent Elements of Christian Theology, (Part. I. chap. i. p. 37—48.) has admirably summed up the argument from the concurrence of profane tradition with the Mosaic history; deducing both from the common source of revelation, disguised indeed and disfigured in the one by allegories and fabulous conceits, but conveyed to us by the other in its pristine and uncorrupted purity. The laborious and valuable researches of Mr. Bryant, Mr. Maurice, and particularly Sir William Jones, have thrown new and powerful lights upon this important subject.

As to the searching, with a curious minuteness, into the resemblances, which subsist, between the Pagan mythologies, and the great truths of the Jewish and Christian revelations; this may undoubtedly be carried too far. And I agree entirely with

Spencer.—“Whatever might be the bent and dispositions of the Israelites, it was Moses’ proper business to rectify them. He was not to indulge them in their fancies, but inform them of their duties, and direct them to what was fit, reasonable, and consistent with good morals and piety, though that happened to be never so much against their gusts and inclinations, which accordingly he every where did: and there are numerous instances of it through all his government of them. His doing otherwise might, indeed, have shown a great deal of *policy*, but not near so much probity and goodness, as are discoverable through his whole conduct of this great people. I can very easily allow Dr. Spencer, that this was the method that Mahomet, Apollonius Tyanæus, and some politicians have taken: nor will I enter into any contest with him, whether the Devil makes use of the same in order to seduce mankind from the worship of God; all which he gives, I think, surely with a little too much looseness, as parallel instances in confirmation of his notion: but this I am mighty sure, Moses was on all occasions very far from it.” pp. 281, 282.—Spencer had justified these observations by his strange assertions. “In eo enim eluxit sapientia divina, quod antidotum e veneno faceret, et illis ipsis ceremoniis ad populi sui utilitatem, *quibus olim Diabolus* ad hominum perniciem uteretur.” And again he cites this political axiom, *το καλον ου μεινονεν εκ εστι κτητων.*

the learned and judicious Mr. Nares, that we are not bound in the proof of the authenticity of revelation, to mark out its traces, amidst the rubbish of absurd fables and disgusting mysteries, which compose the various religions of the Heathen world. See Nares's Bampton Lecture, pp. 251, 252.—And yet, since these resemblances have been employed, by the pen of infidelity, to overthrow Revelation, under the pretence, that the discoveries, which we ascribe to *it*, had been derived from Pagan mythology, it surely must be admitted, that such enquiries of the learned, as tend to reverse this position, possess no inconsiderable value. The engines, designed for the destruction of Christianity, are hereby converted into instruments for its defence. The infidel, who laboured in the support of error, is thus rendered an auxiliary in the cause of truth. And it may perhaps not unfairly be viewed, as a sort of providential retribution, that a Hume, a Bolingbroke, and a Voltaire,* should be pressed into the

* Volney is not, perhaps, of sufficient calibre to be ranked with the above mentioned discoverers of moral and religious truths. And yet, he has given specimens, which prove him not wholly unworthy of such society. He has, amongst many curious matters, *discovered*, that the mysterious birth of the Messiah, signifies nothing more, than the *Sun rising in the constellation of Virgo*; that the twelve apostles, are *the twelve signs of the Zodiac*; and that all the pretended personages from Adam to Abraham, are mythological beings, *stars, constellations, countries.*" Ruins, pp. 348. 388, 389.—Of this work of Mr. Volney, it has been well remarked by a learned writer, that it "is truly styled **THE RUINS**: for that, agreeably to its title, it menaces destruction to every thing that has justly commanded the respect and veneration of man: as it would rob men of the inestimable blessings of peace and good order, of the endearing ties of social connexion, and consequently of what constitutes both public and private happiness; and by breaking the salutary restraints of religion, would banish peace from the human breast, and spoil it of its firmest support in life and surest consolation in death." And to this is most properly subjoined,

ranks with the champions of Revelation, and compelled to march in the triumphal procession which celebrates their own defeat.

The latest claim that has been set up in opposition to the Hebrew Scriptures, is on behalf of the sacred books of the Hindus. These, it has been pretended, evince not only the priority of the Indian records; but also, that Moses has borrowed from the Brahmens, much of what has been commonly ascribed to him as original, especially with regard to the creation of the world. The fallacy of such pretences has, indeed, of late years, been fully manifested, by the valuable exertions of Sir William Jones, and those of his respectable fellow labourers in the field of Indian literature. At the same time, it is to be lamented, that the admissions of that illustrious vindicator of the Hebrew writings, as well as those of Mr. Maurice, and others, respecting the antiquity of the Vedas, have been such as to furnish those, who were desirous to pervert the truth, with an opportunity of applying the produce of their meritorious labours to the prejudice of the Jewish records; an opportunity which was not neglected.* The futility of the attempt

that "its baleful influence is not confined to these alone: that it carries in itself the seeds of its *own* ruin and confusion; and that it would almost require a volume, to enumerate the contradictory and jarring atoms, of which this chaos of confusion is composed." An Enquiry into the origin of the Constellations that compose the Zodiac, p. 197.

Such are the judicious observations of a writer, whose learning has enabled him to overthrow the principal theories, which have been erected by others upon the subject of which he treats; and yet has not prevented the writer himself, from adding one more to the numerous instances, that already existed, of the danger of adventuring into those visionary regions, in which fact supplies no solid footing, and fancy is the only guide.

* See the Advertisement prefixed to the 5th volume of the London edition of the Asiatic Researches; in which, after no-

was, happily, at once, exposed by a few judicious observations in the *British Critic*, (vol. xvi. pp. 149, 150.) and has since received more ample refutation from the pens of Mr. Faber, and Mr. Nares, in their *Bampton Lecture* volumes. But, in truth, notwithstanding that, as has been abundantly proved, such admissions of the great antiquity of the Hindu records, by no means justify an inference, affecting the originality and priority of the Hebrew Scriptures; yet it is fairly to be questioned, whether that antiquity has not been rated much above its real standard.

The astronomical tables of the Hindus, it is well known, supply the only reasonable data from which to judge of their chronology: their habitual exaggerations rendering every other source of chronological information altogether chimerical; insomuch that Sir W. Jones pronounces, (in his *Dissertation on the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India*) "that the comprehensive mind of an Indian chronologist has no limits;" and at the same time proves his assertion by a number of the most extraordinary instances indeed. Their astronomical calculations, therefore, having naturally become a subject of great curiosity and interest with men of Science, the celebrated M. Bailly, in the year 1787, published, at

ticing the antiquity ascribed to the Vedas by the above Orientalists, the Editors insidiously subjoin the following observation. "We shall not take up your time, with a dissertation on the exact age of *either the HEBREW or the HINDU SCRIPTURES*: both are ancient: let the reader judge.—*WHETHER THE HINDU BRAHMENS BORROWED FROM MOSES, OR MOSES FROM THE HINDU BRAHMENS*, is not our present enquiry," p. iv. The merit of these observations, it should be noticed, belongs exclusively to the *London Editors*: the *advertisement* being altogether a fabrication of theirs; and no one part of it being to be found in the original *Calcutta* Edition, of which this professes to be a faithful copy. Such is the use, to which the pure gold of Sir W. Jones would be converted, by these workers of base metal.

Paris, a volume on "the Indian astronomy," in which he contended for its great antiquity, carrying it back to a period of more than three thousand years before the Christian era. This conclusion he founded upon the nature of certain of their astronomical tables; which, he contended, contained internal evidence, that they had been formed from actual observation, and must therefore be carried up to so early a date as that of 3102 A. C. His reasoning upon this subject, in his elaborate *Traité de l'Astronomie Indienne et Orientale*, were followed by other astronomers, particularly by Professor Playfair in the 2d vol. of the *Edinburg Transactions*, in 1789: and the *Surya** *Siddhanta*, supposed to contain the most ancient astronomical treatise of the Indians, was also carried up to a very high date, not less than 2000 years before the Christian era.

That the reasonings, however, which led to both these conclusions, are erroneous, later discussions of the subject leave but little room for doubt. Mr. Marsden, in an ingenious paper in the *Phil. Trans.*

* Mr. Davis, who was the translator of this most ancient of the Sastras, thinks that he finds in it sufficient data, from which, computing the diminution of the obliquity of the Ecliptic at the rate of 50'' in a century, he can fairly infer the age of the work itself to be 3840 years; thereby carrying it back more than two thousand years A. C. (*Asiatic Researches*, vol. ii. p. 238)—But, Professor Playfair, proceeding at a rate of computation, which he conceives more accurate, places the date of the work above three thousand years earlier than the Christian era. (*Edin. Trans.* vol. iv. p. 103.) He therefore thinks himself perfectly secure, in adopting the interval of 2000 years A. C.: in which, also, he fortifies himself by the authority of Sir W. Jones. The demands, both of Mr. Davis and Professor Playfair, must certainly be admitted to be modest, compared with that of the Hindus themselves; who require of us to believe, that this book is 2,164,899 years old, having been at that distant period given by divine revelation.

for 1790, had, without attempting to impeach M. Bailly's astronomical arguments, pointed out a satisfactory mode of accounting for the apparent antiquity of the Indian tables, by conceiving the computations to be founded, not upon a *real*, but an *imaginary*, conjunction of the planets, sought for as an epoch, and calculated retrospectively. The celebrated M. LAPLACE, again, after the most accurate mathematical investigation, has not only* pro-

* I cannot refrain from giving, at full length, the opinions and reasonings of so distinguished a mathematician as M. Laplace, on a point of such vital moment, as that of the great antiquity, which it has been the fashion to ascribe to the astronomical tables of the Hindus: and on a point, also, in which the opinions of a mathematician can alone have weight.

“Les tables Indiennes indiquent une astronomie plus perfectionnée; *mais tout porte à croire qu'elles ne sont pas d'une haute antiquité.* Ici, je m'éloigne à regret de l'opinion d'un savant illustre, (M. Bailly) qui, après avoir honoré sa carrière, par des travaux utiles aux sciences et à l'humanité, mourut victime de la plus sanguinaire tyrannie, opposant le calme et la dignité du juste, aux fureurs d'un peuple abusé, qui sous ses yeux même, se fit un plaisir barbare d'apprêter son supplice. Les tables Indiennes ont deux époques principales, qui remontent, l'une à l'année 3102 avant l'ère Chrétienne, l'autre à 1491: ces époques sont liées par les moyens mouvemens du soleil, de la lune, et des planètes, de sorte que l'une d'elles est nécessairement fictive. L'auteur célèbre dont je viens de parler, a cherché à établir, dans son traité de l'Astronomie Indienne, que la première de ces époques est fondée sur l'observation. *Malgré ses preuves, exposées avec l'intérêt qu'il a su répandre sur les choses les plus abstraites, je regarde comme très vraisemblable, que cette époque a été imaginée pour donner une commune origine dans le Zodiaque, aux mouvemens des corps célestes.* En effet, si, partant l'époque de 1491, on remonte, au moyen des tables Indiennes, à l'an 3102 avant l'ère Chrétienne; on trouve la conjonction générale du soleil, de la lune, et des planètes, que ces tables supposent: *mais cette conjonction trop différente du résultat de nos meilleures tables, pour avoir eu lieu, nous montre que l'époque à laquelle elle se rapporte, n'est point appuyée sur les observations.* A la vérité, quelques élémens de l'astronomie Indienne semblent indiquer, qu'ils ont été déter-

nounced upon the recent date of the tables, but has also pointed out errors in the calculations from which M. Bailly deduced his results; and has clearly de-

minés, même avant cette première époque; ainsi, l'équation du centre du soleil, qu'elle fixe à $2^{\circ}, 4173$, n'a pu être de cette grandeur, que vers l'an 4300 avant l'ère Chrétienne. Mais, indépendamment des erreurs dont les déterminations des Indiens ont été susceptibles, on doit observer qu'ils n'ont considéré les inégalités du soleil et de la lune, que relativement aux éclipses dans lesquelles l'équation annuelle de la lune s'ajoute à l'équation du centre du soleil, et l'augmente d'environ $22'$; ce qui est à-peu-près la différence de nos déterminations, à celle des Indiens. Plusieurs élémens, tels que les équations du centre de Jupiter et de Mars, sont si différens dans les tables Indiennes, de ce qu'ils devoient être à leur première époque; que l'on ne peut rien conclure des autres élémens, en faveur de leur antiquité. *L'ensemble de ces tables, et sur-tout L'IMPOSSIBILITE de la conjonction quelles supposent a la meme époque, prouvent au contraire, qu'elles ont été construites, ou du moins rectifiées dans des temps modernes; ce que confirment les moyens mouvemens, qu'elles assignent a la lune, par rapport à son périée à ses nœuds, et au soleil; et qui plus rapides que suivant Ptolemee, indiquent évidemment que la formation de ces tables est postérieure au temps de cet astronome; car on a vu que ces trois mouvemens s'accélèrent de siècle en siècle.*—Exposition du Système du Monde, pp. 293, 294.

Thus has M. Laplace, from the evidence, which the tables themselves supply, not only overturned the prevailing notion of their great antiquity, but reduced their date even lower than the first century, since he places them lower than the age of Ptolemy, who lived until 161 A. D.

Having been led to make mention of this eminent mathematician, than whom a greater name has not arisen since the days of Newton, I cannot forbear noticing, as a matter of singular curiosity, the coincidence of a remarkable astronomical epoch, as fixed by his calculations, with the year, in which Archbishop Ussher has placed the creation of the world, according to the chronology of the Hebrew. The epoch is that of the coincidence of the greater axis of the earth's orbit with the line of the equinoxes, at which time the true and the mean equinox were the same. This M. Laplace computes to have taken place about the year 4004 before the Christian era; which is the very era of the creation, as chronologists have derived it from the Hebrew scriptures.—*Traité de Mécanique Céleste*, tom. iii. p.

monstrated the epoch in the tables, not to have been *real*, but *fictitious*. And, last of all, *Mr. Bentley* seems completely to have settled the point in his two most ingenious and learned papers, in the 6th and 8th volumes of the *Asiatic Researches*, in which he not only contends, that from the principles of the Hindu astronomy, the recent date of the tables can be deduced; but that also, from authentic testimony, independent of all calculations, the age of the *Surya Siddhanta* can be proved such as not to carry the date of its composition farther back than the year 1068. In his endeavours to establish these points, he has not scrupled to pronounce *M. Bailly* and *Professor Playfair* to have been totally mistaken, in their reasonings, concerning the antiquity of the Indian astronomy; and to have proceeded upon an entire ignorance of the *principles* of the artificial system of the Hindus: the nature of which he states to consist in this,—that “certain points of time *back* are fixed upon as epochs, at which the planets are *assumed* to fall into a line of mean conjunction with the sun in the beginning of Aries; and that from the points of time so assumed as epochs, the Hindu astronomer carries on his calculations, as if they had been settled so by actual observation; and determines the mean annual motions, which he must employ in his system, from thence, as will give the positions of the planets in his own time, as near as he is able to determine the same by observation.” (Vol. vi. p. 542.)—He then proceeds to shew by

113.—This point I have stated, merely for the gratification of the curious reader, without intending to lay upon it any particular stress. At the same time, I cannot avoid observing, that if a coincidence, equally striking, bore an aspect unfavourable to the truth of the scripture history, it would be cried up by a certain class of literati, (who admire *Mr. Brydone's* lavas and such like trash,) as a circumstance amounting to a *demonstration* of the falsehood of the Hebrew Scriptures.

what means, such fictitious epochs may be assumed, without incurring the danger of a perceptible variation from the real mean motions: and upon the whole, he has fortified his argument in a way that renders it not easy to be shaken. The high authority of the names, which Mr. Bentley has to oppose on this subject, (Sir W. Jones himself, having, as well as M. Bailly and Professor Playfair, maintained the antiquity of the Indian astronomy,) may occasion some delay to the reception of his opinions. But, from the proofs which have been advanced in their support, and from the additional lights to be expected upon this subject, there seems little reason to doubt, that they will ere long be generally acquiesced in.

At all events, the main foundation, on which the extraordinary antiquity of the Indian records has been built, must be given up as no longer tenable: and the decided priority of the Mosaic scriptures, cannot any longer reasonably be questioned.* So

* Mr. Nares, in his valuable note upon this subject, (Bampton Lecture, p. 256—273.) seems somewhat reluctant to admit Mr. Bentley's results, in opposition to those which could boast so many distinguished names in their support. He has, however, with great learning and ability, shewn, that even from the evidence, which M. Bailly himself adduces in corroboration of his opinion, no inference can reasonably be drawn, which in any degree interferes with the truth and originality of the Scripture history. Indeed, the whole of Mr. Nares's discussion of this subject, is particularly worthy of attention. Of his entire work, it may be, as it has been, most truly affirmed, that there is perhaps no other extant, which, within the same compass, brings so much argument to bear, against the various enemies of our religion from without, or against the betrayers of it from within. And, as compressing, in the best manner, the greatest quantity of important information, on all the important subjects, on which modern wisdom has attempted to assail Revelation, I most earnestly recommend it to the Theological student.—I cannot permit the very favourable mention, which this author

that, as the Chaldean, Phenician, Egyptian, Grecian, and Chinese antiquities, which at different times have been deemed irreconcilable with the truth of Scripture history, have, to a more minute inspection, contracted their dimensions to a perfect agreement with the Scripture standard; so it may without hazard be pronounced of the Indian antiquities, that the day of their exaggerated extent has nearly gone by; and that there is no longer much danger of any serious impediment, from that quarter, to the belief of the Mosaic history. That the Indians did, at a very early age, cultivate astronomy, and that to them we are indebted, for that most ingenious and useful invention of an arithmetical character, possessing at the same time an absolute and a local value, cannot, undoubtedly, be denied. And yet, it must be admitted, that there are such indications of gross ignorance, in the very science, which they have so much studied, that one scarcely knows how to give them credit for certain other discoveries which are ascribed to them. To make the circumference of the earth amount to 2,456,000,000 British miles (*Asiat. Research. vol. v. art. 18.*) and to hold the moon's distance from the earth to be greater than that of the sun,* are not proofs of any great progress

has made of my former publications on the Atonement, to prevent me from giving a testimony, which the cause of religious truth so imperiously demands.

* "Ils font aussi la Lune plus éloignée de nous que le Soleil, et même ils sont aussi attachés à cette opinion, qu'on l'est encore dans certaines contrées à nier le mouvement de la terre. Un Brame et un missionnaire étant dans la même prison, le premier suffroit assez patiemment, que l'autre entreprît de le désabuser du culte de Brama; mais lorsque, dans d'autres conversations, il vit que le Missionnaire prétendoit, que le Soleil étoit au delà de la Lune, ç'en fut fait: il rompit entièrement avec lui, et ne voulut plus lui parler."—Montuc. *Hist. des Malthem.* tom. i. p. 404.

in astronomical research. On this subject, see Montucla's observations, in the part referred to in the note below. In truth, from circumstances such as these, joined to the fact, of the Indians being unable to give any explanation of, or assign any reasons for, their particular tables and calculations, there seems good reason to think, that much of what has been supposed to be their own invention, has been derived to them from other sources; as has proved to be the case, with respect to the Chinese tables; and as Mr. Nares has well shewn to be extremely probable, with respect to those of the Indians likewise.* Bampt. Lect. pp. 270, 271.

As to the readiness of the Indians to impose fabrications upon the Europeans, all must now be tolerably well satisfied, since the publication of Mr. Wilford's Essay in the viiith volume of the Asiatic Researches, (p. 245—262) in which he confesses, with a grief that had actually reduced him to a fit of sickness, that "his Pundits had totally deceived him, in almost all that he had written about the *Sacred Islands in the West*; having at different times, and in proportion as they became acquainted with his pursuits and his wishes, made *erasures* in the Sanscrit MSS. and on those *erasures* inserted the names, RAJATA-DWEEP, for England, and SUVARNA-DWEEP, for Ireland." He adds, also, that "those frequently recurring *erasures* in most Indian MSS. tended to throw a deep shade over their presumed authority." Another imposition, on a subject infinitely more important, has also since come to light. For, unfortunately, we find, that the remarkable passage in the 3d vol. of the *Researches*, which Sir

* Will not this supposition throw some light upon that extraordinary acquaintance with certain Trigonometrical principles, laid down in the *Surya Siddhanta*, which have excited Professor Playfair's wonder in Edinb. Trans. vol. iv?

W. Jones affirms to be an exact translation by himself, from an Indian MS. forwarded to him by Mr. Wilford, relative to Noah, under the name of *Satyavarman*, and his three sons, *Sherma*, *Charma*, and *Jyapeti*, is ALTOGETHER A FORGERY BY THE BRAHMENS. See As. Res. vol. iii. pp. 465, 466. 312, 313. 320.

I cannot forbear annexing to this Number a passage from an old translation of a work of the celebrated Amyraut. It has a close connexion with the principal topics under discussion; and the singular value of its contents, will, I trust, justify its insertion.—

“Furthermore, whereas it was well said by one, that things of greatest antiquity are best; and the philosophers themselves, when they treat concerning God and religion, extremely cry up antiquity; and attribute much to the dictates of their ancestors; as if nature itself had suggested to them, that there was a source of all these things, from which they, that were nearest it, drew the purest and sincerest waters; whereas, accordingly as they are derived through several minds, as so many several conduit pipes, they become corrupted and tinted with extraneous qualities, and contract impurity. If there be found a doctrine that has all the marks of antiquity, and there appears nothing in the world that equals it, it ought not to be doubted, but that the same proceeded from him that is more ancient than all, as being author of all things. If the language in which it was revealed be as the mother and stock, from which others, though very ancient, are sprung; if it describes the history of the world, and of men, and their propagation upon the earth; if it affords the demonstration of times, and that without it the knowledge of chronology would be more intricate than a labyrinth; if it deduces its history from point to point with an exact correspondence;

if it clearly and certainly relates histories, that are as the body of the fabulous shadows that we see in the writings of the most ancient authors in the world; who will doubt, but all which they have, is taken from thence, and that we ought to refer what is therein depraved and corrupted, thereunto, as to its principle, and have recourse thither to learn what we are ignorant of?—If there be found a religion, all whose parts accord together with an admirable harmony, although it has been propounded at several times, and by several persons, in several places; if there be a discipline, a doctrine, a book, a society, in which God himself speaks to men in a style and manner agreeable to the eminence of his majesty, displays his justice to them most terrible in its appearance, discovers his power in its highest magnificence, and gives them to sound the breadth and length, depth and height of his infinite mercies: lastly, if examples of an incomparable virtue be found therein, with incitations and instructions to piety; such as are not to be paralleled any other where in the world; 'tis an indubitable argument, that they are proceeded from some other than the human mind, or the school of MAN."

In referring to the authors who have illustrated the primary subjects of this Number I ought not to omit the name of Mr. Lloyd, who in his valuable treatise on Christian Theology, has so justly propounded, and so impressively and eloquently enforced, the leading doctrines of the Christian religion. But that this Number has been already carried to an unreasonable length, I should add to it some extracts from his 1st and 2d chapters, which could not fail to enhance its value. From his remarks in the 1st. chap. (particularly p. 6—10.) *on the proper provinces of Natural and Revealed Religion*; and from those in the 2d *on the unity of*

divine truths displayed in the Jewish and Christian dispensations; I can promise the judicious reader much satisfaction and instruction.

IN bestowing upon Lord Bolingbroke the epithet of SOPHIST, in the preceding Number, at p. 59, I feel, upon second thoughts, that I have not been strictly correct in the application of the term. Ingenuity, exerted, under a subtle show of reasoning, for the purpose of misleading and overreaching the controversial opponent, is the distinguishing attribute of the character so denominated. His Lordship, however, has not condescended to deal, in this treacherous manner, with those whom he combats in argument. His magnanimity, and his candour, are both at war with such mean and petty artifices. The one raises him above the little forms of logical and exact ratiocination; and the other inspires him with the disdain of concealing from his opponent any vulnerable part. His argument is, accordingly, of that elevated quality, that deals in lofty language and privileged assertion; and of that intrepid character, that fears not, as occasion may demand, to beat down the very positions, which, when other occasions demanded, it had been found convenient to maintain. The noble writer, in short, too courtly to associate with the antiquated followers of Aristotle, and too free to be trammelled by the rules of a precise and circumscribing dialectic, passes on fluently in one smooth and gentlemanly tenor, undisturbed by any want of connexion between premises and conclusion, and at perfect liberty to relinquish either, or both, just as his lordly humour may happen to direct.—To these ingenuous qualities which exalt his Lordship's *reasoning* above the

pedantic exactnesses of *logic*, is superadded an easy freedom which releases his Lordship's *history* from the troublesome punctilios of fact. So that, upon the whole, there is scarcely any writer, who, in a flowing and copious vein of declamation, possesses, in any degree comparable to his Lordship, the art of arriving at whatever conclusion he pleases, and by whatever route: not merely overwhelming the astonished adversary, by a rapid succession of movements the most unexpected; but displaying still greater argumentative powers, in overturning those very dogmas which had just before been rendered impregnable to all but himself, and thereby defeating the only antagonist worthy to be opposed to so illustrious a disputant.

To be serious, there is no writer of any name, Voltaire perhaps alone excepted, whose attempts upon Christianity are more impotent and contemptible than those of Lord Bolingbroke. The bare enumeration of the positions he has maintained, throughout his *Letters on History*, and what are called his *Philosophical Works*, would be an exposure of ignorance and imbecility, sufficient not merely to satisfy truth, but to satiate malice. It was therefore scarcely necessary that his deistical productions should have been submitted to the careful dissection of *Clayton*, *Warner*, and *Leland*, and the powerful and merciless lacerations of Warburton.* They must soon have done the work for themselves. Having little more than their impiety and their

* See the View of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy in four letters to a friend, in which, all that fervid vigour and burning severity for which its author is so distinguished, are overpoweringly exerted for the purpose of laying bare to the public eye, the miserable deficiencies of his Lordship, as a philosophical writer, under the several heads of *ingenuity*, of *truth*, of *consistency*, of *learning*, and of *reasoning*.

viciousness to recommend them, they must inevitably, excepting only with those to whom impiety and vice are a recommendation, have ere long reached that oblivion, to which, save only with such persons, they are now, I may say, almost universally consigned. On their first publication, it was proposed as the best mode of counteracting their mischievous design, to collect the contradictory passages, and merely arranging them mutually confronted in opposing columns, so to leave them without comment to the reflexions of the reader: and, if I mistake not, this idea was acted on by one writer, in a work, entitled an *Analysis of the Philosophical Works of the late Lord Bolingbroke*. This work I have not seen: but so exact a specimen of this nature is supplied by the very part of this writer's works, to which I have had in the foregoing Number, occasion to refer, that I cannot refuse to produce it for the reader's satisfaction.

Being anxious to prove, in opposition to the received opinion, that the idolatries of the Gentile world could not have been derived from the corruptions of an original Revelation, he peremptorily asserts, that "it is *impossible* for any man in his senses to believe, that a tradition" (namely, that of the unity of God) "derived from God himself, through so few generations, was lost among the greatest part of mankind; or that Polytheism and Idolatry were established on the ruins of it, in the days of Serug, before those of Abraham, and so soon after the deluge." (Philos. Works, 8vo. Ed. vol. i. p. 299.) At the distance of less than two pages, we find it as peremptorily asserted, by this same extraordinary writer, that "Polytheism and Idolatry have the *closest connexion* with the natures and affections of rude ignorant men:" and in less than half a page more, that "the vulgar embrace

them *easily*, even after the true doctrine of a divine unity has been taught and received, as we may learn from the example of the Israelites: and that superstitions grow *apace*, and spread wide, even in those countries where Christianity has been established and is daily taught, as we may learn from the examples of the Roman churches," &c.—But this is not all. We find this same writer again, in vol. ii. p. 200—210, both deny the *fact*, that the divine unity had been taught to the Israelites and soon forgotten by them, (which is the very *example* he builds upon in the above passage) and also the *application* of that fact to the case of other nations, (which application is the very use he has himself made of that fact.)—And then, after all this, and almost in the same breath in which he has made these assertions, he draws back again in part, and says "I do not *so much deny* the truth of the facts, as I oppose their application." (p. 210.) That is,—I cannot resist the recapitulation,—our author first denies a certain fact as *impossible*: then establishes its strong *probability* upon general principles of human nature, supported by an *example* drawn from the case of the Israelites, and *applied* to that of mankind at large: then he both denies the truth of that very *example*, and the justness of its *application* (both of which are his own undisputed property:) and then again he admits them both, in certain (but different) degrees; since he does *not so much deny the one as he opposes the other*. What does all this mean? Is it, or is it not nonsense? Have we not here then, (to use the sort of pleasant and sportive phrase, that might not improbably have been used by such writers as his Lordship,) in beating about for game, sprung a whole covey of contradictions, which, after winging their tortuous course in all directions, have at last sought shelter, by taking flight into the im-

penetrable thickets of nonsense? Now what is to be done with such a writer as this? The author of the memoirs of his life, whilst he speaks in terms much too strong of his qualities as a statesman, remarks, in alluding to the excursions, which, as an author, he had ventured to make beyond his proper sphere: "I should be sorry, that you took your politics from priests; but I should be in more pain if I thought you in danger of receiving your religion from a politician." *Memoirs of the Life of Lord Bolingbroke*, p. 232.

In truth, to sum up all in a word, my Lord Bolingbroke was no more than a coxcomb in literature, and a pretender in science. Nor has religion, though the principal object of his hostility, so much to complain of his bungling attempts as philosophy: at the same time that both have experienced more of malevolence than injury at his hands. With him, the great sages of antiquity have been as much the objects of lordly contempt, as the Prophets and Apostles; and the maxims of ancient wisdom have been held as cheap as the established doctrines of Revelation. Whatever, in short, is not Lord Bolingbroke, is not sense. All, whether ancient or modern, who have trod the same ground before him, historians, chronologists, moralists, philosophers, divines, all are either blockheads or imposters. And even Locke and Newton dwindle into drivellers, where they have presumed to meddle with those subjects, which the *Viscount* condescends to illustrate.—(Phil. Works, vol. ii. Essay 3, *ubique*, especially p. 160.)

The treatment, which the truly wise and learned, both of ancient and modern times, constantly receive at his Lordship's hands, naturally calls to mind the sarcasm of Crito in Berkley's *Alciphron*.—"I tell you, Euphranor, that Plato and Tully might

perhaps make a figure in Athens or Rome : but were they to revive in our days, they would pass but for underbred pedants, there being at most coffee-houses in London, several able men who could convince them they knew nothing, in what they are valued so much for, morals and politics." And Lysicles immediately subjoins, "How many long headed men do I know, both in the court-end and the city, with five times Plato's sense, who care not one straw, what notions their sons have of God or virtue."—Berkeley's Works, vol. i. pp. 369, 370. The versatility, also, with which this noble writer can, at one time, affect grave and learned research, and at another, as it may suit his purpose, profess to hold all such pedantic argumentation in contempt, is most happily illustrated, in the same admirable treatise, by the picture which is there drawn, of the Proteus shiftings and modifications of the free-thinking tribe. "When one of these has got a ring of disciples around him, his method is, to exclaim against prejudice, and recommend thinking and reasoning; giving to understand that himself is a man of deep researches and close argument, one who examines impartially and concludes warily. The same man, in other company, if he chance to be pressed with reason, shall laugh at logic, and assume the lazy supine airs of a fine gentleman, a wit, a railleur, to avoid the dryness of a regular and exact enquiry. This double face of the *Minute Philosopher* is of no small use to propagate and maintain his notions. Though to me it seems a plain case, that if a fine gentleman will shake off all authority, and appeal from religion to reason, unto reason he must go." (pp. 460, 461.) But the truth is, as the same writer again remarks, (p. 639.) "that in the present age thinking is more talked of but less practised than in ancient times; and that since the revival of

learning men have read much and wrote much, but thought (comparatively) little : insomuch that, with us, to think closely and justly is the least part of a learned man, and none at all of a polite man. The free-thinkers indeed make great pretensions to thinking, and yet they shew but little exactness in it. A lively man, and what the world calls a man of sense, are often destitute of this talent, which is not a mere gift of nature, but must be improved and perfected, by much attention and exercise on very different subjects; a thing of more pains and time than the hasty men of parts in our age care to take."

What time *our* man of parts employed for this purpose, may easily be inferred from the circumstance, of his having *commenced* his philosophical investigations at the age of *forty*, after a youth revelled in the most voluptuous and dissipating enjoyments, and a manhood distracted by the most tumultuous political agitations. But it is full time to have done with him; I shall therefore only add to what I have said upon so unworthy a subject, by referring the reader, who can have any curiosity to know more of such a man, to the characters that have been given of him, by Chesterfield and by Blair. The latter concludes a very qualified commendation of his *style*, by observing, that in his *matter* there is "hardly any thing to commend, that in his reasonings, for the most part, he is flimsy and false: in his political writings factious; in what he calls his philosophical ones, irreligious and sophistical in the highest degree."—Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric, vol. i. Lect. xix. p. 282. See also the observations in Lect. xv. p. 211. of the same volume. The former gives such an account of him, upon the whole, as must be edifying, to the young reader particularly; who will thereby be completely let

into the secret of such men, by one of themselves; and will have the benefit of observing, how much even a libertine, when in cold blood, can be shocked by libertinism. One or two passages I cannot avoid transcribing, as proving how greatly, even from the testimony of his warmest admirer, Lord Bolingbroke is found deficient in every thing that is truly valuable, either in a philosopher or in a man. His noble panegyrist, in recommending to his son to study the *manner*, that would best enable him "to seduce and impose," proposes to him Lord Bolingbroke's style and mode of writing, for his imitation, in direct *opposition* to works of learning and sound reasoning, which he particularly decries: and after pressing upon him, again and again, the repeated perusal of Lord Bolingbroke's writings, he assigns as his reason for so doing, that he wishes him "to lay aside all thoughts of all that dull fellows call *solid*, and exert his utmost care to acquire what people of fashion call *shining*."—Chest. Letters, vol. iii. p. 151. And in another place, where he speaks of the whole of that unhappy Lord's character, he is obliged, though with much softening, to describe him as a most mortifying instance of the violence of human passions, and of the weakness of" (what he chooses to call) "the most exalted human reason." "His youth (he says) was distinguished by all the tumult and storm of pleasures, in which he most licentiously triumphed, disdaining all decorum. His fine imagination has often been heated and exhausted with his body, in celebrating and deifying the prostitute of the night; and his convivial joys were pushed to all the extravagancy of frantic Bacchanals. Those passions were interrupted but by a stronger, ambition. The former impaired both his constitution and his charac-

ter, but the latter destroyed both his fortune and his reputation." Vol. ii. p. 328.

Such was the Pythagorean institution of this great Philosopher, who was to be qualified by these intense lucubrations, to communicate new lights to mankind, and to improve the world by a juster set of notions in morals and philosophy. The noble characterizer, after glossing over these hideous enormities, and contrasting with them what he is pleased to represent as splendid qualities, is compelled, after all, to conclude, in words no less applicable to the insincere and unprincipled writer, than to his subject: "Upon the whole of this extraordinary man, what can we say, but, alas, poor human nature!"—Poor indeed, when it presumptuously rejects those aids which heaven designed to minister to its weakness, and to rectify its corruption.

In a course of observations, in which I have insensibly been drawn to enlarge at so much length, upon the subjects of free thinking and scepticism, it is impossible to forget David Hume. The ideas suggested in the progress of it, bring into view, by necessary association, this chief of modern sophists: who, whether the precedence be determined by the boldness of impiety, the contempt of truth, the perplexities of disputation, or the inconsistencies and contradictions in reasoning,—is undoubtedly entitled to the first place in the list of British infidels. The leading subject also of the discussion, in which we are at present engaged, naturally summons him to our tribunal. For, as his philosophic forerunner, Bolingbroke, has bestowed much unprofitable labour on the questions of polytheism and the divine unity, the same questions solicit the minutest investigations of this author, especially in his treatise upon the *Natural History of Reli-*

gion;* a title, which, as has been remarked, contains a form of expression, much as proper, as if he had spoken, of the *Moral History of Meteors*. And here, having positively pronounced, that "Polytheism must have been the first, *and most ancient*" (which certainly *may* be admitted if it was the *first*;) "religion of mankind:" (Essays, vol. ii. p. 402) and having affirmed it to be an *incontestible fact*, that about 1700 years back *all* mankind were Polytheists; (p. 403) and that, *as far as history reaches*, mankind appear *universally* to have been Polytheists; at the same time that he does not pretend to be ignorant, that about 1700 years back, there was in existence such a book as the Old Testament, and such a history as that of Josephus; and that he himself informs us, (p. 433) that it appears from Herodotus, that "the Getæ were genuine Theists and Unitarians:"—having, I say, thus dogmatized as became a sceptic, and falsified as became a historian, he proceeds in a manner perfectly his own, to shew what never had been dreamed of before, not even in the craziest reveries of a Bolingbroke, that the notion of the *Divine Unity* had sprung up from the blundering conceptions of THE VULGAR, and that it demanded the reasoning powers of THE PHILOSOPHERS to restore again the old system of a *plurality of Gods!!!*

This will hardly be credited. Let the reader

* On this treatise Warburton makes the following observations, in a letter to his friend Hurd. "The Essay is to establish an atheistic naturalism, like Bolingbroke: and he goes upon one of Bolingbroke's capital arguments, that idolatry and polytheism were before the worship of the one God. It is full of absurdities. They say this man has several moral qualities. It may be so. But there are vices of the mind as well as body: and a wicked heart, and more determined to do public mischief, I think, I never knew." Letters of a late Eminent Prelate, p. 239.

therefore turn to the precious original, (p. 435.) where he will find the manner fully described, in which *this* notion takes its rise amongst *the vulgar*, for of these it is that he has been speaking throughout the preceding page. "Men's exaggerated praises and compliments still swell their idea upon them; and elevating their deities to the utmost bounds of perfection, at last beget the attributes of *Unity* and *Infinity*, *simplicity* and *spirituality*." Thus, then, the ONE, INFINITE, UNCOMPOUNDED, and SPIRITUAL *first cause*, springs, as we see, out of the tendencies of the *vulgar* to *praise and panegyric*. But immediately after we find, that this is a height too giddy for those who have thus risen to it, and that it is necessary that they should be quietly let down again to the firmer and more peaceful footing of Polytheism. For, "such refined ideas, being somewhat disproportioned to VULGAR COMPREHENSION" (although having *grown naturally* out of vulgar conception) "remain not long in their original purity: but require to be supported by the notion of inferior mediators or subordinate agents, which interpose between mankind and their supreme deity. These demi-gods or middle beings, partaking more of human nature, and being more familiar to us, become the chief objects of devotion, and gradually recall that idolatry which has been formerly banished by the ardent prayers and panegyrics of timorous indigent mortals."—See also pp. 429, 430, or rather the whole of the extraordinary reasoning upon this subject in the 6th, 7th, and 8th sections.—Thus then we see, that the *vulgar* in their high flights of *praise and panegyric*, rose to the discovery of a *first cause*; while a set of *wiser men** we

* In truth Mr. Hume himself seems entitled to rank amongst those *wiser men*, as he has been able to discover many advan-

must suppose called in to restore the mob of middle deities to their pristine honours, since the purpose is to suit the objects of worship to *vulgar com-*

tages in the scheme of polytheism. For, he says, if we examine without prejudice, the ancient heathen mythology, as contained in the poets, we shall not discover in it any such monstrous absurdity, as we may at first be apt to apprehend. Where is the difficulty in conceiving, that the same powers or principles, *whatever they were*, which formed this visible world, men and animals, produced also a species of intelligent creatures of more refined substance, and greater authority than the rest? That these creatures may be capricious, revengeful, passionate, voluptuous, is easily conceived; nor is any circumstance more apt among ourselves to engender such vices than the license of absolute authority. And in short the whole mythological system is *so natural*, that in the variety of planets and worlds contained in this universe, it seems *more than probable*, that somewhere or other it is really carried into execution." Essays, vol. ii. p. 242.—Thus the cautious investigator, whose scepticism will not yield to the proofs of the existence of *one* God, sees no difficulty in admitting it as *more than probable* that there are *many*. In this system of polytheism also our philosopher finds many advantages. For "where the Deity is represented, as infinitely superior to mankind; this belief, though altogether just, when joined with superstitious terrors, is apt to sink the human mind in the lowest submission and abasement, and to represent the monkish virtues of mortification, penance, humility and passive suffering, as the only qualities which are acceptable to him. But where the Gods are conceived to be only a little superior to mankind, and to have been many of them advanced from that inferior rank, we are *more at our ease* in our addresses to them, and may even without profaneness, aspire sometimes to a rivalry and emulation of them: hence activity, spirit, courage, magnanimity, love of liberty, and all the virtues which aggrandize a people." Ibid. p. 440. Our author has forgotten to add, that in our aspirings to a rivalry with these nearer Gods, that he proposes as the objects of our addresses, we might rise also to that capriciousness, revengefulness, passionateness, voluptuousness, and other such qualities with which he has been pleased to invest them, and which qualities seem in the view of himself and Mr. Gibbon to be the principal ingredients in that "*elegant mythology*," which they would so strongly recommend to our admiration. It has been well remarked, by an eloquent and interesting writer, that anti-chris-

prehensions. And so we find, that, under the direction of this wonder-working *χορηγος*, the philosophers and the people are made at once to change sides, and act each other's parts; the *people* taking to themselves the *discovery of the first cause*, and the *philosophers*, in return, the *discovery of demi-gods and middle beings*. Unless indeed, as Bishop Hurd says, the *people* are supposed to have done both; "discovered the *unity* in their *blind, timorous, and indigent* state, and when they were so *well-informed*, struck out, in a lucky moment, their gross system of *Polytheism*."* On this, and the whole monstrous assemblage of falsehoods, inconsistencies, and nonsense, with which this extraordinary Essay†

tian writers, while they are giving us their opinions, may in truth be giving us more; may be discovering their *morals*, while they mean to teach us only their *creed*: and thus may carry, like Bellerophon, their own condemnation, while they imagine they are, graciously, conveying intelligence and new light to mankind. So that the old proverb, Bellerophontis Literæ, may be a proper motto for the learned labours of them all.—Young's Centaur, p. 29.

* Diderot, indeed, in his execrable *Système de la Nature*, has completed the view of this subject, that had been so imperfectly sketched by Bolingbroke and Hume. He has manfully undertaken to prove, not only that Polytheism must have been, in the early ages of the world, the necessary result of men's observation of nature; but that it must be much more so now, *that the course and progress of philosophy has tended to remove men's prejudices!!*—This completely relieves Hume's argument from all its perplexities.

† Mr. Nares, in his admirable collection of sermons, preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1805, pronounces of this extraordinary production, that if he wished to satisfy any person of the indispensable necessity of a divine revelation in the first ages of the world, upon the infidel's own view of things, he would refer him at once to Mr. Hume's *Natural History of Religion*. (Nares's Bampton Lectures, p. 485.) And Dr. Maclaine says of the same work, in his Letters to Mr. Soame Jenyns, that perhaps no book is more adapted to show the unspeakable advantages of a divine Revelation.

is stuffed, I would refer the young reader to the Remarks on Mr. David Hume's Essay on the Natural History of Religion, in which Dr. Hurd* has so successfully employed the weapons, with which his friend Warburton had just before transfixed the brother infidel Bolingbroke.

Yet such writers as these, such writers as *Hume* and *Bolingbroke*, (at least until their ignorance, falsehood, and absurdities had become sufficiently notorious to expose their followers to the like imputations,) it had been the fashion to extol and admire. How such writers could ever have obtained followers, may at first sight indeed appear difficult to explain. The difficulty however admits a satisfactory solution; and one which has been so justly given by a late respected writer, that I shall content myself with the mere repetition of what he has said upon the subject. Having remarked, that, in his Treatise of Human Nature, Mr. Hume's vain love of singularity had led him to endeavour to involve even the fundamental principles of *geometry* in confusion; but that finding it impossible by his paradoxes on such a subject to rouse the attention of the public, he turned himself to *moral paradoxes*; this writer goes on to shew, that Mr. Hume in doing so had calculated rightly, for that these, "when men begin to look about for arguments in vindication of impiety, debauchery and injustice, become wonderfully interesting, and can hardly fail of a powerful and numerous patronage. The corrupt judge; the

* This work has been here, agreeably to the hitherto commonly received opinion, ascribed to Bishop Hurd. But, from the Letters of Bishop Warburton lately published, it now appears, that it was the production of his own pen, and received only some additional colouring from his literary friend. See a curious account of this transaction in the Letters of a late Eminent Prelate, pp. 239, 240.

prostituted courtier; the statesman, who enriches himself by the plunder and blood of his country; the pettifogger, who fattens on the spoils of the fatherless and widow; the oppressor, who, to pamper his beastly appetite, abandons the deserving peasant to beggary and despair; the hypocrite; the debauchee; the gamester; the blasphemer;—prick up their ears when they are told, that a celebrated author has written a book full of such comfortable doctrines as the following:—That justice is not a natural but an artificial virtue, depending wholly on the arbitrary institutions of men, and previous to the establishment of civil society not at all incumbent:—That moral, intellectual, and corporeal virtue, are all of the same kind; in other words, that to want honesty, to want understanding, and to want a leg, are equally the objects of moral disapprobation, and that it is no more a man's duty to be grateful or pious, than to have the genius of Homer, or the strength and beauty of Achilles:—that every human action is necessary, and could not have been different from what it is:—that when we speak of power as an attribute of any being, God himself not excepted, we use words without meaning:—that we can form no idea of power, nor of any being endued with any power, *much less* of one endued with infinite power: and that we can never have reason to believe that any object or quality of an object exists, of which we cannot form an idea:—that it is unreasonable to believe God to be infinitely wise and good, while there is any evil or disorder in the universe; and that we have no good reason to think that the universe proceeds from a cause:—that the external material world does not exist; and that if the external world be once called in doubt as to its existence, we shall be at a loss to find arguments by which we may prove the being of God, or any of

his attributes:—that those who believe *any* thing certainly are fools:—*that adultery must be practised, if men would obtain all the advantages of life; that if generally practised, it would soon cease to be scandalous; and that, if practised secretly and frequently, it would by degrees come to be thought no crime at all*.* that the question concerning the substance

* “My inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals is of all my writings, historical, philosophical, or literary, incomparably the *best*.” Hume’s Life, p. vii.—The passage, referred to above, affords an excellent specimen of the writer’s qualifications as a moral instructor. And yet it is of *such a man as this*, that *such a man as Adam Smith* has delivered the following testimony:—“I have always considered Mr. Hume, both in his life time and since his death, as approaching as nearly to the idea of a PERFECTLY WISE AND VIRTUOUS MAN, as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit.” Letter from Adam Smith, L. L. D. to W. Strahan, Esq. annexed to Hume’s Life, and prefixed to the late edition of Hume’s History of England.—For the reception, which such a declaration as this so amply merited, I refer the reader to Bishop Horne’s Letter to Dr. Adam Smith: in which, as well as in the Letters on Infidelity at large, he will find the ablest and most incontestable confutation of Hume and his infidel associates.

In truth, the extract from Hume on the subject of adultery appeared to me so monstrous, that, with some doubts of Dr. Beattie’s accuracy, I turned to the original to ascertain its fairness, and there found the following justification of the reporter:—“It is needless to dissemble. The consequence of a very free commerce between the sexes, and of their living much together, will often terminate in intrigues and gallantry. *We must sacrifice somewhat of the useful, if we be very anxious to obtain all the agreeable qualities; and cannot pretend to reap alike every advantage.* Instances of license daily multiplying will weaken the scandal with the one sex, and teach the other by degrees to adopt the famous maxim of La Fontaine, with regard to female infidelity; *that if one knows it, it is but a small matter; if one knows it not, it is nothing.*” (Hume’s Essays, vol. ii. p. 394.) Again (p. 255) he contends, that the necessary “combination of the parents for the subsistence of their young is that alone which requires the virtue of chastity or fidelity to the married bed. Without such a utility, it will readily be owned (he asserts) that *such a virtue would never be thought of.*” And, this

of the soul is unintelligible:—that matter and motion may often be regarded as the cause of thought: that the soul of man becomes every different moment a different being, so that the actions I performed last year, or yesterday, or this morning, whether virtuous or vicious, are no more imputable to me, than the virtues of Aristides are imputable to Nero, or the crimes of Nero to the man of Ross." *Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth*, by Dr. Beattie, p. 111—113. See also pp. 315, 316, where many other doctrines equally rational and valuable are to be found, together with the references to those parts of Mr. Hume's works in which they are contained.

But this is not all. Mr. Hume had not done enough, it seems, for the extinction of religion and

being a favourite subject with this writer, whose *Inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*, is boasted of by himself as his best work, he proceeds to enlarge upon it in an additional note, (p. 490) in which he calls in the aid of Greek to sustain him in his philosophic profligacy, and referring all notions of virtue and vice to *public utility*, asks with an air of final triumph,—“And indeed to what other purpose than that of utility do all the ideas of chastity and modesty serve?” This is the PERFECTLY WISE AND VIRTUOUS MAN of Adam Smith.

Dr. Aikin's remarks (in the *General Biography*.) on this extraordinary language of Dr. Smith, although not pressing upon the parts of Hume's writings here adverted to, deserve to be noticed. “We may (he says) reasonably demur to Dr. Smith's moral estimate, in attributing the perfection of virtue to a man, whose *leading principle* was, by his own confession, SELFISH, (the acquisition of literary fame,) and who never seems to have made any of those sacrifices of interest and inclination to public good, in which virtuous action chiefly consists. Further, whatever degree of freedom of discussion may be justifiable, with the benefit of mankind in view; it may be doubted, whether a mere fondness for speculation, or a love of philosophic applause, will morally excuse a writer, for sporting with opinions, which are commonly held of the highest importance to human welfare.”

the subversion of morals : but, with a zeal, bespeaking his fidelity to the master whom he served, he left behind him blasphemies to be published after his death, which even *he* was afraid to publish whilst he lived. So indeed his great admirer, tells us, in his Apology for the Life and Writings of David Hume : whose posthumous papers, he says, would probably “carry his philosophy still nearer to THAT POINT, which he might not think it DISCREET to *push too vigorously* in his life time.” What THAT POINT WAS, is but too evident on a single glance at the works which he thus bequeathed for the public benefit. The Dialogues on Natural Religion, and the Essay on Suicide, are standing monuments of a heart as wicked, and a head as weak, as ever belonged to any man, who pretended to the character of a philosopher and a moralist. To leave deliberately as a legacy to mankind, a recommendation of SELF MURDER, and an assurance that there is no GOD, at the very moment when he was himself about to appear before the bar of that dread being ; and, whilst thus occupied for the destruction of his fellow-creatures, to amuse himself with pleasant conceits about *Charon* and his *ferry-boat*, (as his biographer informs us he did, when he was almost dropping into his grave,) has something in it so frightful, that one naturally recoils from the thought of it with horror. It seems to be equalled only by the hideous impiety of Diderot, who adduces it as a decisive proof of the non-existence of a God, that he was permitted to write a work, filled with blasphemies against his nature, and arguments against his being.*

* “Si ce Dieu tout puissant est jaloux des ses prerogatives, —comment permet-il, qu’un mortel comme moi, ose attaquer ses droits, ses titres, son existence même ?” Vol. ii. p. 60. of *Systeme de la Nature* ; a work which was published under the name of Mirabaud, but is supposed with good reason to have had the atrocious Diderot for its author.

Having however made mention of this valuable bequest of Mr. Hume, I cannot deny the reader the satisfaction of knowing somewhat of the precious material of which it consists. And first, as to his *Dialogues*. He there exhibits various modes, in which the world may have been produced, all of which he pronounces to be to the full as satisfactory, as that of a creation by the will of the Deity. *Generation* or *vegetation*, he says, will answer the purpose : and the latter process, which he prefers, he thus particularly explains : “ In like manner as a tree sheds its seed into the neighbouring fields, and produces other trees, so the great vegetable, the world, or this planetary system, produces within itself certain seeds, which, being scattered into the surrounding chaos, vegetate into new worlds. A comet, for instance, is the seed of a world : and after it has been fully ripened, by passing from sun to sun, and star to star, it is at last tossed into the unformed elements which every where surround this universe, and immediately sprouts up into a new system.” (*Dialogues*, p. 132.) But, as this process of vegetable production, supposes a mother vegetable already in existence, or a world already in being, so accurate a reasoner could not but account for the formation of the first world, from which all others are to sprout. And this he does in two ways, that he may the better satisfy all descriptions of readers. Either such a process has been going on from eternity : or a world might have been formed originally thus ;—“ A finite number of particles is only susceptible of finite transpositions : and it must happen in an eternal duration, that every possible position must be tried.—The continual motion of matter therefore in less than infinite transpositions, must produce order ; and order, when once established, supports itself.” (*Dialogues*,

pp. 146. 149.)—Now must not Ephraim Jenkinson, and his *cosmogonies*, hide their diminished heads, on a comparison with this *Philosopher* and his *sublime inventions*? How far inferior also was the object of the former sage to that proposed by the latter? The one but sought to cheat the honest *Vicar of Wakefield* of his horse, but the other looks to the more glorious attainment, of cheating mankind, of their trust in a God, and their hopes of a futurity.—How meagre and unphilosophical is the first chapter of Genesis, compared with such lofty speculations as these of Mr. Hume!!

If we turn now to that other valuable performance, the *Essay on Suicide*,* there we find truths no less momentous, and reasonings no less acute, than those which the former had exhibited. He informs us, that the whole scope of man's creation is limited to the present life:—that the life of a man is of no greater importance than that of an oyster:—and as it is admitted that there is no crime in diverting the Nile or the Danube from their courses, so he contends there can be none, *in turning a few ounces of blood from their natural channel*: and so, upon the whole, he peremptorily concludes, in favour of self-murder!!! He goes farther: and to satisfy the conscience of the *Theist*, he maintains that on the supposition of a God, we are acting under the *direction* of Providence, when we put an end to our existence: and again to satisfy the conscience of the *Christian*, he endeavours to evince the *lawfulness of suicide under the Christian dispensation*. The last point indeed, it has been

* Some of Mr. Hume's admirers became so much ashamed of this monstrous and absurd performance, that they were led to deny that it ever came from his pen. Whoever wishes for a complete proof of his being the author, may consult the *Monthly Review* for 1784, vol. lxx. p. 427.

remarked, it is not difficult to make out, provided the liberty of putting two texts together be permitted :—thus, *Judas departed, and went and hanged himself.—Go and do thou likewise.* Mr. Hume's arguments are little better.

So much for this *paragon of modern metaphysicians* ; this *deep thinker* and *acute reasoner*, whom it was at one time so much the fashion with wittings and libertines to extol. As to certain advantages of style, Mr. Hume, no doubt, possessed them ; but as to his *reasoning*, nothing under that name can be more contemptible. This indeed seems now pretty generally admitted : and few, who have any regard for the opinion of men of sense, would, at this day, venture to support the paradoxes, and adduce the arguments of David Hume. By the species of reasoning adopted by that writer, Dr. Beattie has well remarked, it would be easy to prove any doctrine ; and to evince this, he supplies the following RECIPE, as conveying the whole mystery of the manufacture of *his* metaphysical paradoxes. “—Take a word (an abstract term is the most convenient) which admits of more than one signification : and by the help of a predicate or copula, form a proposition suitable to your system, or to your humour, or to any other thing you please, except truth. When laying down your premises, you are to use the name of the quality or subject, in one sense ; and, when inferring your conclusion, in another. You are then to urge a few equivocal facts very slightly examined (the more slightly the better) as a further proof of the said conclusion ; and to shut up all with citing some ancient authorities, either real or fictitious, as may best suit your purpose. A few occasional strictures on religion as an unphilosophical thing, and a sneer at the *Whole Duty of Man*, or any other good book, will give your dissertation what many are pleased to call a *liberal turn* ; and will go near to convince

the world, that you are *a candid philosopher, a manly free-thinker, and a very fine writer.*" (Essay on Truth, p. 309.) This gives by no means an exaggerated idea of Mr. Hume's mode of conducting his metaphysical disquisitions; so that, what has been said of his Dialogues, may be applied, with truth, to almost all his reasonings on moral or religious subjects:—namely, that they cannot possibly hurt any man of a philosophical turn, or even any man of common sense: that they may serve indeed to confirm the giddy, the profligate, and the unprincipled in their prejudices against religion and virtue, but must be despised by every man who has the smallest grain of seriousness or reflexion.

Gray's estimate of his character I cannot prevail upon myself to suppress, not only because it comes from a man of real genius, learning, and reflexion, but because it must be admitted to be altogether untinctured with the supposed prejudices of a divine.—"I have always thought David Hume a pernicious writer, and believe he has done as much mischief here as in his own country. *A turbid and shallow stream often appears to our apprehensions very deep.* A professed sceptic can be guided by nothing but his present passions, (if he has any,) and his interests; and to be masters of his philosophy we need not his book or advice, for every child is capable of the same thing, without any study at all. Is not that *naivetè* and good humour, which his admirers celebrate in him, owing to this, that he has continued all his days an infant, but one that unhappily has been taught to read and write? That childish nation, the French, have given him vogue and fashion, and we, as usual, have learned from them to admire him at second hand." (Mason's Gray,* vol. ii. pp. 249, 250.)

* For some admirable and beautiful remarks by the same author, on the Materialists, and upon Lord Shaftesbury, and

There are two striking features in the character of Hume, which have not been adverted to in the sketch here drawn of him by Gray:—his *disingenuousness*, and his *bigotry*.

To couple the term *bigot** with the name of *David Hume*, may at first sight appear to partake of his own paradox. But it should be considered, that bigotry is not necessarily connected with religious belief; and that it is no less possible to display its invincible prejudices, by an irrational and intolerant

particularly on Lord Bolingbroke and his Philosophical Works, see the same volume, p. 118—125. With respect to Hume, we are informed by Mr. Ritchie, that he was particularly stung by the severe animadversions of Gray. For, as the biographer adds, “notwithstanding the eulogium which he sometimes bestows on the equanimity of his own temper, it is known, that he felt the attacks on his literary reputation with exquisite sensibility: and although he persevered in the resolution of writing no answers to his antagonists (except in the single case of his quarrel with Rousseau) he did not always receive the criticisms of others with the apathy he professes. Account of the Life and Writings of David Hume, p. 301. Indeed, if we yield credit to the account given of him in the London Review for 1777, we shall pronounce him one of the most choleric, instead of being one of the calmest, of philosophers. His Treatise of Human Nature having experienced considerable severity of criticism in a publication entitled, The Works of the Learned, the author (as the Review states) became so highly provoked, that “he flew into a violent rage to demand satisfaction of Jacob Robinson the publisher; whom he kept during the paroxysm of his anger, at his sword’s point, trembling lest a period should be put to the life of a sober critic by a raving philosopher.”—It is well known also, that his resentment against Dr. Beattie was so violent, that he could hardly put upon it any decent restraint.

* I find indeed from an anecdote in Ritchie’s Life of Hume, that I have his own authority for this epithet. For, as his biographer informs us, his reply to a friend, who jocularly threatened him with writing an account of his life and character, was, that as to his character he would himself give it in a single sentence; “candid and liberal with respect to the prejudices of others, *bigoted* with respect to his own.”

zeal against, than for, religion. Now undoubtedly, in this sense, no man has proved himself more of a bigot than Hume. Far from being the calm and philosophic enquirer which he pretends to be, he is evidently influenced by an insatiable zeal for the propagation of his Atheistical tenets; and his intolerant and persecuting spirit against those, who oppose the adoption of his infidel creed, is every where manifested by his furious abuse of all who are tenacious of their Christian hopes, but more particularly of the clergy, and these too of every religious persuasion without distinction. Of this, abundant proofs are to be met with, in almost every part of his writings: but more especially in his 21st Essay, on National Characters, (Essays, vol. i. p. 215.) where, and in the annexed note T, he pronounces "priests of all religions to be the same," and goes on laboriously to prove, that *a PRIEST, as such, MUST be destitute of every virtue, and possessed by almost every vice.* How strongly Horace Walpole, (whom I particularly name, as not having any undue leaning towards revelation, and as being, it must be supposed, tolerably free from that *odium theologicum*, which our author so plentifully charges against the clergy,)—how strongly, I say, he condemns this intolerant zeal in this man of pretended moderation and philosophic calmness, may be seen on looking into his works.*—Now, surely, this is a most unrea-

* Lord Orford indeed omits no opportunity of expressing his dislike and even contempt of the common run of what are called *Geniuses*, and *Philosophers*, in modern times. "No *Genius* I have known, (says he,) has had common sense enough to balance the impertinence of their pretensions. THEY HATE PRIESTS, BUT LOVE DEARLY TO HAVE AN ALTAR AT THEIR FEET: for which reason it is much pleasanter to read them than to know them." (Lord Orford's Works, vol. v. p. 421.) This observation, though immediately directed against Rousseau, who was at this time introduced into England by Hume, was

sonable intrusion into what our author so willingly admits to be the exclusive province of the clergy. There is some excuse for warmth, in the man who perceives an attempt to rob him of what he holds most precious; but there is none for the man, who makes that attempt, flying into a passion, because it is resisted.

Again, as to the *disingenuousness* of Hume; this is sufficiently manifest on the inspection of his works. The instances adduced by the various writers, who have taken the trouble to expose his flimsy sophisms, are so multiplied as to render it unnecessary to dwell upon this subject. Of these writers, in addition to the authors of the well-known answers to his Essay on Miracles, (an essay which but for adventitious circumstances could not have deserved an answer,) I would particularly recommend to the young reader, Dr. Beattie, and Bishops Hurd and Horne, who have, in the works already alluded to in this Postscript, exhibited this imposing and deceitful infidel in his true colours. Nor is it only in matter of *reasoning*, but in matter of *fact*, that he stands convicted of dishonesty. No writer, perhaps, has established this more clearly than Dr. Elrington, in his Donnellan Lecture Sermons, to which I refer particularly at pages 233, 234. and 296—302.

It is but fair however to confess, that Mr. Hume has not confined altogether to religious subjects, his talent of disingenuous representation. His unfaithfulness, and gross partiality, as a *historian*, have been long pretty generally acknowledged: and manifestly not designed exclusively for him. And although Hume is frequently spoken of in terms apparently favourable, yet even in his Lordship's letters to Hume himself, (vol. iv. p. 260—265) the cutting sarcasms and contemptuous sneers against authors and philosophers of a certain class, sufficiently intimate in what light the noble author really viewed the Scotch as well as the French philosopher.

it has been pronounced by judicious and candid writers, upon the subject of English history, that the History which Mr. Hume has given to the world, is a most injurious work to put into the hands of the British youth, in order to give them just ideas of the history or constitution of England. Dr. Towers, in his *Observations on Mr. Hume's History*, says, that "fidelity, accuracy, and impartiality are requisite in a historian : and that in these Mr. Hume is greatly deficient."—Dr. Gilbert Stuart also points out, in his *View of Society in Europe*, (see particularly pp. 320. 323. 326.) many gross and wilful errors in the *Historian* :—and at p. 327, he fully demonstrates, how unfit Mr. Hume was for the task which he undertook.—"Mr. Hume (he says) struck with the talents of Dr. Brady, deceived by his ability, disposed to pay adulation to government, or willing to profit by a system, formed with art, and ready for adoption, has executed his history upon the tenets of this writer. Yet, of Dr. Brady it ought to be remembered, that he was the slave of a faction, and that he meanly prostituted an excellent understanding, to vindicate tyranny, and to destroy the rights of his nation. With *no less pertinacity*, but with an air of greater candour, Mr. Hume has employed himself to the *same purposes* : and his history, from its beginning to its conclusion, is chiefly to be regarded as a plausible defence of prerogative. No friend to humanity, and to the freedom of this kingdom, will consider his constitutional enquiries, *with their effect upon his narrative*, and compare them with the ancient and venerable monuments of our story, without feeling a lively surprise, and a patriot indignation." Mr. Fox also, in his late celebrated work, speaks of the continual display, in Hume's History, of his "partiality to kings and princes, as intolerable. Nay (he adds) it is, in

my opinion quite ridiculous : and is more like the foolish admiration, which women and children sometimes have for kings, than the opinion, right or wrong, of a philosopher.”—And a set of writers, whose national partialities would not indispose them to Hume, agree fully in this sentiment. “ Few things (they say) seem more unaccountable and indeed absurd, than that Hume should have taken part with *high church* and *high monarchy* men. The persecutions which he suffered in his youth from the Presbyterians, may perhaps have influenced his *ecclesiastical partialities*. But that he should have sided with the Tudors and the Stuarts against the people, seems quite inconsistent with all the *great traits of his character*.” (Edin. Review, vol. xii. p. 276.) What great traits of character? We have already seen what they amount to. No, no : the man who is not influenced by a love of truth, must be destitute of principle. And, in such a character, inconsistencies must abound. Where there is no standard to refer to, no anchor to hold fast, what can be expected but perpetual vacillation? The man who laboured to traduce Scripture, would not fail to falsify history. He who could be blind to the grandeur and glory of the Christian dispensation, could not easily discover the beauty and the sublimity of the British constitution. And we need not be surprised to find the same man, a renegade in religion, and a slave in politics.

The mischievous and dishonest uses, also, to which Hume perverts his history, should not pass without observation. Mere historic falsehood had lost much of its interest in the breast of this writer, had it not been made subservient to his favourite object, the subversion of moral and religious truth. The picture, which has been already drawn of the historian in this light, is sketched with such justness

and good taste by the masterly pencil of Mrs. H. More, that I cannot do better than present it to the reader's view as it has come from the hand of that admirable woman.

"There is a sedateness in his manner, which imposes; a sly gravity in his scepticism, which puts the reader more off his guard, than the vehemence of censure, or the levity of wit; for we are always less disposed to suspect a man who is too wise to appear angry. That same wisdom makes him too correct to *invent* calumnies, but it does not preserve him from doing what is scarcely less disingenuous. He implicitly adopts the injurious relations of those annalists who were most hostile to the reformed faith,* though he must have known their accounts

* Villers, in his *Essay on the Reformation*, (Mills's translation, p. 107.) offers the following observations, which go to support the above allegation, and deserve to be particularly attended to.—"It is well known with what fury the rage of party pours out calumny upon eminent men. Upon Luther, above all men, it has been discharged in torrents. Among other causes, it has been found out, that his zeal arose only from the discontent of the Augustins, who beheld, it is said, with envy the Dominicans invested by the Pope with the commission of preaching indulgences. That Maimbourg should have picked up such a story is nothing wonderful. But it is inconceivable, that Voltaire and Hume should have repeated it as a certain fact." This author then proceeds to expose the falsehood of the calumny, and refers to a note of Dr. Maclaine on Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, in which, he says, is "proved, beyond dispute, the absurdity of the imputation." The translator pursuing the same subject, goes on thus. "The credit of Voltaire is now so low in this country, that no means, however base, of forwarding a favourite object will be thought beneath him. He is now detected; and his authority is of very little value. But Hume, who through the whole course of his history lies in wait for an opportunity of throwing discredit upon the cause both of religion and of liberty, who possessed a rooted enmity against all the best interests of mankind, and whose actions exhibit more of deliberate misanthropy than those of any other man perhaps that ever lived, still enjoys a reputation and

to be aggravated and discoloured, if not absolutely invented. He thus makes others responsible for the worst things he asserts, and spreads the mischief

authority which he by no means deserves; and his writings contribute strongly to corrupt the public sentiments. Dr. Maclaine's note, referred to by Villers, is a full exposure, more full perhaps than was necessary, of one of those instances of bad faith with which his history abounds. If any one were to publish an edition of his history, with notes, pointing out the eagerness with which he has used not only lawful but poisoned arms against religion and liberty, exposing the unfounded assertions, the weak reflections, and the barbarous phraseology which he so often employs, he would abate that false admiration so long attached to his works, and confer a great obligation upon the public." These charges against Hume may possibly not be sufficiently temperate and measured: but they contain in them much of truth; and the principal charge, that of historical bad faith, is undoubtedly made out by Dr. Maclaine, in the note alluded to; which note I here subjoin, not merely because it establishes the point at present under consideration, but because it so completely rescues the author of the Reformation from the unfounded calumnies which Hume had contributed to circulate, and which of late days an interested zeal has propagated in this country with more than usual industry.

"Mr. Hume, in his history of the reign of Henry the 8th, has thought proper to repeat what the enemies of the Reformation, and some of its dubious or ill informed friends, have advanced, with respect to the motives that engaged Luther to oppose the doctrine of indulgences. This elegant and persuasive historian tells us, that the *Austin friars* had USUALLY been employed in SAXONY to preach Indulgences, and from this trust had derived both profit and consideration: that ARCEMBOLDI gave this occupation to the Dominicans; that MARTIN LUTHER, an Austin friar, professor in the University of Wirtemberg, resenting the affront put upon his own Order, began to preach against the abuses, that were committed in the sale of indulgences, and, being provoked by opposition, proceeded even to decry indulgences themselves. It were to be wished, that Mr. Hume's candour had engaged him to examine this accusation better, before he had ventured to repeat it. For, in the first place, it is not true, that the *Austin friars* had been USUALLY employed in Saxony to preach Indulgences. It is well known, that the commission had been offered alternately, and sometimes jointly, to all the Mendicants, whether *Austin friars*, *Dominicans*, *Franciscans*, or *Carmelites*. Nay, from the year 1229, that lucrative commission was principally intrusted with the *Dominicans*; and in the records which relate to Indulgences, we rarely meet

without avowing the malignity. When he speaks from himself, the sneer is so cool, the irony so sober, the contempt so discreet, the moderation so

with the name of an *Austin friar*, and not one single act by which it appears that the Roman Pontif ever named the friars of that order to the office under consideration. More particularly it is remarkable, that, for half a century before Luther (i. e. from 1450 to 1517,) during which period Indulgences were sold with the most scandalous marks of avaricious extortion and impudence, we scarcely meet with the name of an *Austin friar* employed in that service, if we except a monk, named Palzius, who was no more than an underling of the papal questor Raymond Peraldus: so far is it from being true, that the *Augustine Order* were exclusively, or even *usually* employed in that service. Mr. Hume has built his assertion upon the sole authority of a single expression of Paul Sarpi, which has been abundantly refuted by De Priero, Pallavicini, and Graveson, the mortal enemies of Luther.

“ But it may be alleged, that, even supposing it was not *usual* to employ the *Augustin friars* alone in the propagation of indulgences, yet Luther might be offended at seeing such an important commission given to the *Dominicans* exclusively, and that, consequently, this was his motive in opposing the propagation of indulgences. To shew the injustice of this allegation, I observe *secondly*, that in the time of Luther, the preaching of indulgences was become such an odious and unpopular matter, that it is far from being probable, that Luther would have been solicitous about obtaining such a commission either for himself or for his order. The princes of Europe, with many bishops and multitudes of learned and pious men, had opened their eyes upon the turpitude of this infamous traffic: and even the Franciscans and Dominicans, towards the conclusion of the 15th century, opposed it publicly, both in their discourses and in their writings. Nay more, the very commission, which is supposed to have excited the envy of Luther, was offered by Leo to the General of the Franciscans, and was refused both by him and his order, who gave it over entirely to Albert, bishop of Mentz and Magdeburg. Is it then to be imagined, that either Luther, or the other Austin friars aspired after a commission, of which the Franciscans were ashamed? Besides, it is a mistake to affirm, that this office was given to the Dominicans in general; since it was given to Tetzel alone, an individual member of that order, who had been notorious for his profligacy, barbarity and extortion.

insidious, the difference between Popish bigotry and Protestant firmness, between the fury of the persecutor and the resolution of the martyr, so lit-

“ But, that neither resentment nor envy were the motives that led Luther to oppose the doctrine and publication of indulgences, will appear with the utmost evidence, if we consider in the *third* place,—That he was never accused of any such motives either in the edicts of the pontiffs of his time, or amidst the other reproaches of the contemporary writers, who defended the cause of Rome, and who were far from being sparing of their invectives and calumnies. All the contemporary adversaries of Luther are absolutely silent on this head. From the year 1517 to 1546, when the dispute about indulgences was carried on with the greatest warmth and animosity, not one writer ever ventured to reproach Luther with these ignoble motives of opposition now under consideration. I speak not of Erasmus, Sleiden, De Thou, Guicciardini, and others, whose testimony might perhaps be suspected of partiality in his favour; but I speak of Cajetan, Hogstrat, De Prierio, Emser, and even the infamous John Tetzel, whom Luther opposed with such vehemence and bitterness. Even Cochläus was silent on this head during the life of Luther; though after the death of that great Reformer he broached the calumny I am here refuting. But such was the scandalous character of this man, who was notorious for fraud, calumny, lying, and their sister vices, that Pallavicini, Bossuet, and other enemies of Luther, were ashamed to make use either of his name or testimony. Now, may it not be fairly presumed, that the contemporaries of Luther were better judges of his character and the principles from which he acted, than those who lived in after-times? Can it be imagined, that motives to action, which escaped the prying eyes of Luther’s contemporaries, should have discovered themselves to us who live at such a distance of time from the scene of action, to M. Bossuet, to Mr. Hume, and to other abettors of this ill-contrived and foolish story? Either there are no rules of moral evidence, or Mr. Hume’s assertion is entirely groundless.” Mosheim’s Eccles. Hist. cent. xvi. sect. i. chap. 2. vol. ii. pp. 17, 18.

Dr. Maclaine has very properly observed, that the cause of the Reformation (which must stand by its own intrinsic dignity, and is, in no way, affected by the views or characters of its instruments) can derive no strength from this inquiry, but as it may tend to vindicate the personal character of a man, who has done eminent service to the cause of religion. In truth, so far

the marked; the distinctions between intolerant phrenzy and heroic zeal so melted into each other, that though he contrives to make the reader feel some indignation at the tyrant, he never leads him to feel any reverence for the sufferer. He ascribes such a slender superiority to one religious system above another, that the young reader, who does not come to the perusal with his principles formed, will be in danger of thinking that the reformation was really not worth contending for. But, in nothing is the skill of this accomplished sophist more apparent, than in the artful way in which he piques his readers into a conformity with his own views concerning religion. Human pride, he knew, naturally likes to range itself on the side of ability. He therefore skilfully works on this passion, by treating with a sort of contemptuous superiority, as

from looking for selfish and ignoble motives to account for Luther's zealous opposition to the publication of indulgences by Tetzel, one has only to read the account given by Mosheim of this transaction, to have his astonishment excited, that Luther's did not start up in thousands to raise their voices against it.—“This bold and enterprising monk,” he says, speaking of Tetzel, “had been chosen, on account of his uncommon impudence, to preach and proclaim in Germany, those famous indulgences of Leo X. which administered *remission of all sins, past, present, and to come, however enormous their nature*, to those who were rich enough to purchase them. The frontless monk executed this iniquitous commission, not only with matchless insolence, indecency, and fraud, but even carried his impiety so far, as to derogate from the all-sufficient power and influence of the merits of Christ.” The translator adds, in exemplification, that “in describing the efficacy of these indulgences, Tetzel said, among other enormities, *that even had any one ravished the mother of God, he (Tetzel) had wherewithal to efface his guilt*. He also boasted, *that he had saved more souls from hell by these indulgences, than St. Peter had converted to Christianity by his preaching*.”—Yet Hume could discover no cause for Luther's resistance of such indulgences, but that he had lost the sale of them himself.

weak and credulous men, all whom he represents as being under the religious delusion. To the shameful practice of confounding fanaticism with real religion, he adds the disingenuous habit of accounting for the best actions of the best men, by referring them to some low motive; and affects to confound the designs of the religious and the corrupt, so artfully, as if no radical difference subsisted between them." (Mrs. H. More's *Hints for a Young Princess*, vol. i. p. 156--158.) Thus does this elegant writer describe the pernicious tendencies of Hume's *History*, which, as possessing at the same time many of the beauties of style, she happily characterizes in a word, as "a serpent under a bed of roses." (p. 155.)—And thus we see, that in no occupation of Mr. Hume, whether exercising himself as the light Essayist, the deep Philosopher, or the grave Historian, does he ever lose sight of the one great warfare, in which he had enlisted himself against truth, virtue, and religion.

In this Postscript to the foregoing Number, I have wandered far indeed from my subject; but by no means from my object. For if I shall have the good fortune of impressing any one of my youthful readers, with a just opinion and abhorrence of such writers as Bolingbroke and Hume, I conceive I shall have done no small service to the cause of truth, of virtue, and of religion.

NO. LXX.—ON THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE ANNUAL EXPIATION UNDER THE LAW, AND THE ONE GREAT EXPIATION UNDER THE GOSPEL.

PAGE 49. (z)—The sacrifice on the anniversary of expiation seems to be distinguished from all others by a peculiar degree of solemnity, as if to mark its more immediate reference to the great sacrifice of Christ. Thus, on this day, we find the

High Priest exclusively commanded to officiate : and on this day alone, in the stated exercises of his office, was he *permitted* to enter into the *Holy of Holies*, and to carry the blood of the victim into the *presence* of God, to offer it before that *Glory*, which, seated between the two cherubims, overshadowed the mercy seat, and represented the divinity :—a circumstance, which the Apostle particularly marks, (Hebr. ch. ix.) as prefiguring the entrance of our great High Priest, with the blood offered by him for our redemption, into the true presence of the most High, the immediate habitation of God's holiness and glory. The *High Priest* also seems to have been selected for the solemn services of this day, as more adequately representing the *whole* assembly, in whose name he sacrificed and supplicated forgiveness ; and therefore more properly typifying him, who, representing the whole human race, was to procure redemption by his blood for the whole assembly of mankind.

Whoever wishes for a more minute detail of the particulars of this solemn sacrifice, and of its peculiar fitness to represent the sacrifice of Christ, may consult Outram. De Sacr. lib. 1. cap. xviii. §. 6, 7. lib. 11. cap. iii. §. 2, 3, 4. He will also receive much satisfaction, from an examination of Ainsworth's comment on the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus. For many valuable remarks, connected with the subject of this Number, Daubeny's Discourses on the Connexion between the Old and New Test. may be consulted. And in Rhenferdus's treatise De Comparatione Expiationis Anniv. Pontificis Max. V. et N. Test. (Meuschen's Nov. Test. &c. p. 1013—1039.) a most copious and circumstantial enumeration is given, of the particulars, in which the annual expiation by the Jewish High Priest resembled the one great expiation of the New Testament. It may

be proper to observe, that such is the force of the resemblance, that Socinus himself admits this anniversary sacrifice of atonement,—inasmuch as “it was of special divine ordinance, at a stated season, offered by the High Priest, and appointed to atone for *all* the sins of *all* the people,”—to be fairly accounted typical of the sacrifice of Christ.—Socin. Oper. (Prælect. Theol. cap. xxii.) tom. 1. p. 583.

NO. LXXI.—ON THE NATURE AND IMPORT OF THE CEREMONY OF THE *SCAPE-GOAT*.

PAGE 50. (a)—On this, see what has been said in pp. 282, 283, of vol. i. and attend particularly to the 5th, 7th, and 10th verses of the xvth. ch. of Leviticus, from which it appears, that the *two goats* are, throughout the chapter, spoken of as *one* sin-offering; being expressly so *called* in the first of these verses; presented *jointly* as the offering of the people in the second; and though separated into two distinct *parts* by the lot cast in the 9th verse, yet *each* described as contributing to the *atonement* for the people, as appears from the 10th verse compared with the 17th. Indeed, that the *two goats* made but *one* sin-offering on this occasion, the best commentators freely admit. See Jameson’s observations on this ch. of Leviticus. The reason of this seems obvious. The death of the animal was requisite to represent the *means* by which the expiation was effected: and the bearing away the sins of the people on the head of the animal was requisite to exhibit the *effect*; namely, the removal of the guilt. But, for these distinct objects, two animals were necessary to complete the sin-offering.

It must be allowed, that an account somewhat different has been given of this matter by some very judicious commentators. The goat sent into

the wilderness, and that which was offered up in expiation, jointly, they say, typify the great Redeemer of mankind: the former animal exhibiting that, which could not be displayed by the latter, as having been slain; namely, that Christ was not only to be *delivered for our offences*, but to be *raised again for our justification*, (Rom. iv. 25;) and that although he was to be *crucified through weakness*, yet he was to *live by the power of God*. (2 Cor. xiii. 4.) Thus Ainsworth, Bochart, Alting, and before them Augustine and Procopius, understand it. The opinion of these writers, respecting the truth to be illustrated by the dismissal of the second goat, may perhaps not improperly be combined with that, which has been here proposed: so that whilst the goat, which was slain, exemplifies the sacrifice offered for the sins of mankind; that which was sent away alive, may represent, not only the removal of those sins in consequence of that sacrifice, but also the restoration to life of him by whom they were so removed. Whether, however, this point be admitted or not, the circumstance of the two goats jointly constituting one offering, by exhibiting the different adjuncts, cannot, I think, with any reason be controverted.

Rhenferd contends, that this point is completely established by an evidence resulting from the nature of the ceremony itself. For he says, the imposition of hands, and the confession and implied translation of sins upon the victim, being usual in the sacrifice of animals in expiation; and this ceremony being omitted in the case of the goat that was slain, whilst it was employed in the case of the goat that was sent away; decidedly prove, that both animals were designed to be considered as one offering, and that the latter, consequently, represented him who was to bear the sins of Israel, and by his sufferings

to expiate and to remove them.—See Jac. Rhenferd exp. anniv. &c. p. 1033, of Meuschen, Nov. Test. ex. Talm.

Whoever may have a curiosity to know, whether any, and what ceremony, analogous to that of the Scape-goat, is observed by the Jews of modern times, on the *day of Expiation*, may turn to vol. i. pp. 209, 210, where he will find, that a *cock* is now substituted for the legal victims; and that the entrails of the animal to which the sins of the offerers are conceived to have been transferred by imprecation, are exposed upon the top of the house, to be carried away by the birds into their solitary haunts, in like manner as under the law, the scape-goat had been conceived to carry away the sins of the people into the wilderness. See also Buxtorf. Synag. Jud. and Broughton's Dictionary of Religions, Article *Expiation*.

NO. LXXII.—SOCINIAN OBJECTIONS URGED BY A DIVINE OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH, AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF THE VICARIOUS IMPORT OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES, AND AGAINST OTHER DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

PAGE 51. (b)—The arguments in behalf of the vicarious import of the Mosaic sacrifices, have been so fully examined in Numbers XXXVIII and XXXIX, that nothing need here be added to what has been already offered upon this head.

It is with great regret that, in reverting to this subject, I feel myself obliged to notice the following observations; which have been recently hazarded by a *Divine of the established Church*, with a rashness and a flippancy which cannot too strongly be condemned.

“Those who seek a protection for their absurd and unscriptural ideas of a vicarious punishment, under the shelter of the Jewish ritual, do not con-

sider that that ritual was *solely* intended to preserve the Jews from the idolatry and polytheism of the neighbouring nations, by keeping their imagination sensibly interested, their minds perpetually employed, and their time continually occupied with the performance of rites and ceremonies, sacrifices and oblations, which all tended to keep alive in their minds the unity of the Godhead; and thus to preserve them a distinct people, till the time appointed came for the opening of the Christian dispensation; when the distinction between Jew and Gentile was to be done away.* There are, I know, some people

* The same idea this author takes pains frequently to enforce. In his *Religion without Cant*, (p. 112.) he states it thus. "The ceremonial laws of the Mosaic dispensation were intended *merely* to preserve unbroken the barrier between Jew and Gentile, till the coming of him," &c.—And yet, will it be believed, that in the very same page, this determined enemy of every thing typical in the Mosaic dispensation, affirms, that in the Mosaical law, the *great scheme of redemption* was obscurely insinuated, rather than distinctly portrayed, in *types and figures*, in the *sacrifices* of the altar, and the *atonements* of the Priest. The *Redeemer*, he adds, was *seen through the rites of the Mosaic dispensation*, as through a veil or a glass, darkly." How then does this "wise and sober" writer differ from those "whose fancy prevailing over their judgment" has led them to view the Mosaic dispensation as containing in it something typical of the Christian? He admits, that the *sacrifices* and *atonements* under the one, did obscurely typify the *great scheme of Redemption* in the other. And who contends that the type was any other than a faint and obscure draught of the reality? Thus, then, he saves his reader the trouble of confuting the assertion, that the Jewish ritual was *solely* intended to form a barrier between Jew and Gentile, and that none but a visionary could ever have dreamed of its bearing a typical relation to the Christian Scheme.

This is not the only case in which the freedom and variety of this author's views have led him to mutually confronting positions on the same subject.—To select one instance more out of a rich abundance.—In p. 179, of the last named work, he tells the Christian, that "it is only by personal acts of sin, *hardening into habits* of sin, that he becomes a transgressor,

whose fancy is stronger than their judgment, who suppose that the varied sacrifices and ordinances of the Mosaic ritual, and indeed all the fractional parts of the Mosaic dispensation, were intended only as types and figures of particular facts and doctrines in the history and institution of the Messiah.—Those, whose minds are not fitted for larger and grander views of the ways of God, may well employ their time in these puerile conceits, but they will be despised by wise and sober men, who do not like to assimilate the operations of the Deity to the trick and pantomime of a conjurer.”—The Guide to Immortality, by Robert Fellowes, vol. iii. pp. 55, 56.

Such are the modest insinuations of a divine, whose mind is of course “fitted for large and grand views of the ways of God;” whose comprehensive ken enables him, although unaided by any lights from scripture, to discern what was the *sole* design of the Jewish ritual; who is possessed of “a judg-

subject to the wrath of God;” and, agreeably to this, he asserts again, in p. 210, that “it is not by some occasional misdoings that we are to pass sentence on any man;”—that, “in estimating the worth of the human character, we are not to form our calculations on the conduct of one single day, but to take the average of many days and years, and see what *proportion* a man’s *violation* of his duty bears to its *performance*, his *virtues* to his *vices*, his *sins* to his *righteousness*.”—And yet this indulgent moralist, who had thus far endeavoured to relieve us from any inconvenient pressure of sin upon our consciences, by enabling us to reduce the balance against us in the debtor and creditor account of transgression and righteousness, shortly after turns upon us, all at once, with this unpleasant sentence: “*The moment* we have violated *any one* duty of truth, justice, and humanity, or any one saying of the perfect law of Christ; *that moment* we are *polluted with guilt*; and without repentance obnoxious to punishment.” See p. 220.—Really, it were by no means unadvisable, that a writer (not excepting even a teacher of theology,) should take some little pains to know what his own opinions were, before he proposed them for the instruction of the public.

ment," that at once detects the silly fancies of all such as "suppose" that that ritual could bear any relation to the Messiah ; and who is also "wise and sober" enough, to "despise" all those, who by forming such a supposition, "assimilate the operations of the Deity to the trick and pantomime of a conjurer."

Now, who are the persons, who, by forming such strange suppositions, and by indulging in such "puerile conceits," have rendered themselves the objects of this gentleman's contempt? Not to speak of the person alluded to in the last note, (who probably stands too well with the author, to be exposed to any portion of that scorn, which is to be shared among those who entertain such notions,) one of the first and most distinguished in this way is the Apostle Paul. *He* has gone the unreasonable length of endeavouring to prove in a most minute and laboured detail, that the institutions of the Law were but shadows of things to come. But then, of St. Paul, and his various "puerile conceits," this writer makes no account. The Apostle, he informs us, "labours with mysterious meanings, *which he fails in developing with sufficient perspicuity.*" He was of the sect of the Pharisees, who were wont to allegorize on the literal sense of scripture. His writings have a tincture of *cabalistical* refinement—and even occasionally *glimmer with a ray of Grecian philosophy.*" "The Epistle to the Romans is *bewildered* with the polemical Christianity of that day." His epistles, generally, are "filled with the abstruse discussions of *Rabbinical* learning; or relate to questions which are at present of *more curiosity than importance.*" "A modern believer has" (consequently) "very little concern with any of the epistles of this Apostle;" or indeed, it must be added, with any of the epistles, all of which

this writer finds to be “involved in a tenfold obscurity;” and to which he pronounces it impossible, that we could ever pay the smallest attention, but that “we prefer stumbling in darkness; that we delight more in error than in truth; or that we imagine there is no piety where there is no mystery.” *Picture of Christian Philosophy*, Pref. p. iv.—vi. pp. 131, 132. See also, *Guide to Immort.* vol. iii. pp. 230, 231, where the same point is again earnestly enforced. In another work, (*Relig. without Cant*, pp. 13, 14.) the same author takes care to acquaint his reader, more particularly, with those *pharisaical dogmas* and *heathenish notions*, which St. Paul had so deeply imbibed; and he illustrates the power of ancient *prejudices* over the mind of the Apostle, by a happy and elegant allusion to the *tang of the tainted cask*; which, as he has presented it in a Latin phrase, likely to excite attention from its *novelty*, will, he thinks, give to “the sagacious” a sufficient idea of his meaning.

Of his meaning, in truth, no person can entertain a doubt. His language is plain and intelligible enough. It is neither more nor less than this; that St. Paul, and indeed the Authors of all the Apostolical epistles, have shewn themselves to be mere drivellers: that we should consequently reject all their fancies; discard the hitherto received *doctrines* of Christianity, as idle dreams; and regard the Gospel *merely* and *exclusively* as a *moral system*, or, as he chooses sometimes to term it, as a *rule of life*. This is the point which this writer mainly labours to establish throughout his various theological* publications. And for the purpose of

* The Anticalvinist, A Picture of Christian Philosophy, Religion without Cant, and the Guide to Immortality, are the works, with which this author has favoured the public on theological subjects. [Another theological work has, I understand,

effecting this, he strenuously contends that the Christian religion contains in it *no* doctrine that is *mysterious* ;* that it pronounces a good *moral* life

issued from the same pen, since the time at which this note was written: but what the nature of its contents may be, I confess I have not been anxious to discover.]—Of these several volumes, all largely discanting upon the morality, to the disparagement, or rather to the exclusion of the doctrines of the Gospel, the Christian excellence which forms the favourite theme, is *benevolence*. It were well, if he had treated those, from whose opinions he thinks proper to dissent, with that mildness and brotherly forbearance, which might prove him to have written under the influence of the virtue which he so highly praises. His language, on the contrary, is every where that of the bitterest rancour, and the most arrogant contempt, against all who embrace the doctrines which he rejects, and which, in subscribing the articles of the church to which he belongs, he bound himself by a solemn promise to maintain. Nay, he even dooms to the place of future torments, in common with the most profligate and abandoned of sinners, all who have taught the “false and pernicious doctrines of innate depravity, imputed righteousness, and such other dogmas as are contrary to goodness.” *Guide to Immort.* vol. i. p. 316. Yet with all this gall perpetually discharging itself, charity and the kindly affections are the never-ending topics of declamation; a declamation even sometimes swelling into pindaric.

Love, indeed, of one kind or other, is with this writer so favourite a theme, that a late work, in which he has indulged in the effusions of poetry, is exclusively devoted to the subject. It must be confessed, however, that the love there treated of, is as far removed from *Christian* love, as any that a *Christian* minister could feel himself justified in recommending.—*Poems chiefly descriptive of the softer and more delicate sensations and emotions of the heart!!!* Surely, surely, there is mischievous stuff enough of this kind abroad, without calling in the clergy, to contribute *their* stock of silly *love songs*, to the encrease of the nuisance.—And yet, perhaps, the love songs of this clergyman are not more mischievous than his theology. They certainly are not more poetic.

* “In the following work, it will perhaps be objected that I have introduced no mysteries; but whatever is mysterious is unnecessary. The essentials of a religion consist in few, and those the plainest truths.”—“*False* religions may extol the importance of *mysteries*: but there is no mystery in the true.”—

to be the *only* requisite condition* of salvation; that in the Gospels alone are to be found comprised every useful truth and every religious duty; and

Guide to Immortality, vol. i. pref. p. xiv.—Similar language is scattered plentifully amongst the pages of this work. Being thus prepared to render all perfectly smooth throughout the Gospels, and the Epistles being altogether discarded, our author proceeds with his pruning knife in his hand, and freely and unsparingly lops or bends every thing to his own wish, and as he conceives, to the great edification of his reader. And yet, strange to say, notwithstanding his *plain reasoning*, which “all men in the possession of reason may understand,” he has left behind him mysteries not less than those which he boasts to have removed; if that which cannot be comprehended be allowed to be mysterious. Amongst many such, his observations upon the incarnation and the atonement, supply notable specimens. The very opening of his work, indeed, cannot fail to satisfy all who examine it, of his qualifications as a commentator, who is to remove from the sacred writings all the obscurities of mystery. Confessing that he cannot discover what meaning should be assigned to the word *Λογος*, he “gives no translation to this *mysterious* term, but retains in the text the original word *Logos*, to which he leaves every reader at liberty to annex whatever interpretation he may think best.” (Vol. i. p. 3.)—This is certainly a new mode of removing a difficulty:

* Guide to Immor. vol. i. p. 327.—This is also the familiar language of Mr. F. throughout. The clergy, he says, (vol. i. p. 323.) “ought solely and exclusively to be the *moral teachers* of the people.” (He means to say, that the clergy “ought to be solely and exclusively *moral* teachers of the people.”) Indeed he carries this point so far, that he would have “the ministers of the Establishment COMPELLED to teach *nothing* but that pure morality which Christ taught, without any *cant* or *mystery*.”—Religion without Cant, p. 131.—It has been remarked of the work so entitled,---which deals, usque ad nauseam, in the cant or common-place usual with a certain class of writers on the subjects of *liberality, benevolence, morality, &c.* blended, at the same time (in the indulgence it is to be presumed of benevolent and moral feelings,) with no small portion of the cant of *invective* against all the supporters of the established religion,---that instead of being denominated *Religion without Cant*, it might by a slight transposition have acquired a much more appropriate description, *Cant without Religion*.

that consequently in his own work, which professes to give a just view of whatever the Gospels teach, the Christian reader will meet "a faithful and a cheering *Guide to Immortality*." The author goes yet farther: he holds, that our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount "contains a summary of *every thing* which it is necessary to believe or to practise." (Anti Calvinist, pp. 13, 25.) So that even his own three volumes, explanatory of the true meaning of

and Mr. F. is evidently not quite satisfied with it himself. He therefore in the succeeding notes, calls in the aid of Dr. Lardner, and labours, with the help of this Socinian ally, to explain the nature of that, the term to express which he does not venture to translate. And now the matter comes out, that this *Logos*, let the word mean what it may, must actually be *God himself*. For if it be the *reason*, the *wisdom*, or the *power* of God, then what but *God himself* can it be?—Thus the first point gained in making the matter plain, is, that the *attribute* of any Being, is that *Being*.—Well then, this *Logos* is actually *God himself*. How goes on the *plain reasoning* now?—*In the beginning was God; and God was with God; and God was God*.—So far there is no mystery undoubtedly; nor yet in the succeeding assurance, that *God was in the beginning with God*. And for such communications, it must be conceded to Mr. F. and his Socinian auxiliaries, that the Evangelists could have but little need of inspiration. But as we advance a little farther, we find that this *Logos*, (that is, *God*,) is called *The Light*; and that this *Light*, which in one verse is *God*, becomes, in the next, the *Messiah*, "the visible image of the wisdom of God;" and that immediately after it becomes *God* again.—(See the notes, p. 3--7. vol. i. of *Guide*, &c.)---So much for the freedom from mystery, and clearness of exposition, in which this author exults; and for the want of which he every where indulges in the most indignant invectives against such as give support to the creeds and articles of the Established Church; all of whom indiscriminately he never fails to abuse as ignorant and intolerant, in a manner that evidently marks where these terms may justly be applied.

A glance at the exposition of the introductory verses of St. John's Gospel, as given in pp. 60, 61, of the first vol. of this work, will satisfy the reader, with what associates this *Church of England* divine is to be ranked in his comments upon Scripture.

the four Evangelists, are in a great degree superfluous; inasmuch as the substance of a few chapters which have been given by one of them, comprehends all that is actually requisite. This is undoubtedly making brief work with the writings of the New Testament; and, in this view of the case, he might with as much propriety have entitled his book, a *short cut*, as a *cheering guide, to immortality*.

But that we may appreciate the more justly the value of this writer's theological opinions, it is necessary to observe, that whilst he every where insists* on the propriety of confining the entire range of Christian instruction within the limits of our Lord's discourses, as recorded by the Evangelists, he at the same time very candidly informs us, that some of the grandest and most important truths of Christianity were not made known to the Apostles until after their master's death. "The great *mystery* of a *suffering* Messiah," he says, (and with what consistency he talks of *such* a mystery, or of *any* mystery whatever, let the reader judge) "could not prudentially be explained, and was not openly and unreservedly taught till after his resurrection." (Guide, &c. vol. i. p. 344.) In the sentence prece-

* Besides what has been already quoted upon this subject, in p. 113, we find the following remarks in this writer's Guide to Imm. vol. iii. p. 231.—"Those who prefer religious speculation to the practice of religion, or who wish to keep alive the memory and to re-kindle the heat of controversies, whose lustre and whose interest have long since been lost in the night of ages, may dedicate the best portion of their days to the *fruitless study of that imperviously dark and inextricably bewildering polemical matter*, which is still preserved in the Apostolical epistles." "But the precepts of Christ, as they are contained in his various parables and discourses in the four Evangelists, contain *all* the instructions which are necessary to our improvement in righteousness;—include, in short, every essential principle of genuine Christianity."

ding this, he takes care to state distinctly, that during the life of our Lord, this knowledge was withheld even from his immediate followers. Neither could it have been communicated to them, in the interval between the resurrection and ascension, consistently with the representation of the case which this author gives: for he particularly acquaints us, (which he admits to be more than the Evangelists themselves have done,) with the subjects of our Lord's discourse during that interval. "It was principally occupied with instructions relative to their (the Apostles') ministry." But "*all things necessary for the belief or the practice of men,* and which are essential to salvation, our Lord had *repeatedly* inculcated on his disciples *before his death.*" And accordingly, "the Apostles delivered nothing necessary to salvation, which Christ had not previously enjoined in his discourses to his disciples; and of which we have a copious summary in the writings of the Evangelists." (Guide, &c. vol. iii. pp. 229, 230.)—What now follows from all this?—That "*the great mystery of a suffering Messiah,*" is of no importance in the Christian scheme. For nothing is important that is not contained in our Lord's discourses delivered before his death, and as they are given to us by the Evangelists: and in these discourses, we are told, the subject of a suffering Messiah is carefully suppressed.

But we have not yet done with the *variety* of the author's views upon this head. He has again and again assured us, that our Lord had, in several discourses before his death, communicated to his disciples every important truth: and yet he freely confesses, in other places, that there were several important truths which were not so communicated, but which our Lord had promised to convey to his disciples by the spirit of truth, whom he would send

to them after his death. (Guide, vol. iii. p. 64.)—It is true indeed, that as to this *holy spirit*, or *paraclete*, Mr. F. questions,* (p. 63.) whether it may not simply signify Christ's RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION!!" This, however, he proposes only to the "*dispassionate and deep-thinking*."—But what again shall we say of the Evangelical narration, as Mr. F. describes the matter in another place? (p. 68.) "*After my resurrection, I will declare to you the will and counsels of the Father without any indistinctness or obscurity.*" And yet to this he immediately subjoins; "the sacred historians have only *very briefly* recited the discourses of Jesus with his disciples *after his resurrection*."—Thus then, "*the will and counsels of the Father*," the *expounding in all the scriptures, (beginning from Moses and all the prophets,) the things concerning himself*,—which were vouchsafed by Christ to his disciples after his resurrection, and which the Evangelists have (not "*briefly*," but) not at all "*recited*," are to be sought

* "It is a question, which may be proposed to calm and dispassionate and deep-thinking men, whether our Lord, under the idea of a paraclete or counsellor, spoke of his resurrection and ascension; events which so greatly contributed to dispel the prejudices, to enlighten the minds, and to elevate the hearts of his disciples; and in short, to lead them into all truth."—So much for *plain, unrefined, natural* exposition. Now, if in speaking of the comforter that was to be sent, our Lord meant his resurrection and ascension, it is evident that we may substitute these words for that which they imply, wherever it is spoken of. And then, our Lord's address to his disciples would run thus: "If I go not away, *my resurrection and ascension* will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him (i. e. *my resurrection and ascension*) unto you. And when he is come," &c. "However, when he cometh, even the spirit of truth, (or, in other words, *my resurrection and ascension*) he will guide you into all truth: for he (that is, *my resurrection and ascension*) will not speak of himself," &c.—I certainly must leave this to "the dispassionate and deep-thinking," for I find it quite beyond the reach of *my* comprehension.

for precisely where it is confessed that they are not: and the Gospels are alone to be referred to, for clear and distinct views of doctrines, which the Gospels do not contain; whilst that part of scripture is to be rejected as unnecessary and even injurious, which was specially allotted to the purpose of communicating to mankind, that knowledge of the truth, which the spirit of truth, as well as the words of our Lord, conveyed to the Apostles, subsequent to his resurrection.

Thus we find this writer, who is to clear away all mystery and difficulty from Scripture truth, perpetually at variance with himself no less than with the real doctrines of Christianity. Surely, he should have endeavoured to form at least a *consistent* set of opinions, before he attempted to obtrude them on the public; and more particularly, before he ventured to fly in the face of the whole Christian world, by an open rejection of one of the most important portions of inspired scripture. Humility however, is not one of the *weaknesses* of this writer; and certainly knowledge is not his *fort*.—Any reply to the arguments advanced by Mr. Fellowes, for the rejection of the epistles in the investigation of the Christian doctrines, is rendered unnecessary by the arguments themselves. Independent of their extravagance, (I had almost said their folly,) they carry in them, as we have seen, their own refutation. In truth, the object of our Saviour's life was to supply the subject, not to promulgate the doctrines of the Gospel. The Evangelists therefore confine themselves to the simple duty of narration: and the doctrines, which altogether depended upon what our Lord had done and suffered, particularly upon his death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, were, after this groundwork was fairly laid, to be fully set forth by those, to whom our

blessed Saviour had solemnly promised the unerring aid of the Holy Spirit, and who were especially designated by him for that very purpose. See p. 358—360. of vol. i. for farther observations upon the attempt made by Dr. Priestley and his Socinian phalanx, similar to this of Mr. F's. to beat down the authority of the Epistles. By rejecting the Epistles, or, which is the same thing, the doctrines which they contain, Mr. F. indeed thinks that he may reconcile* "Jews, Turks, and infidels, of whatever denomination" to Christianity. (Guide, &c. vol. i. pref. p. xv.)—No; that he will not effect: but he will accomplish this,—he will render Christiani-

* Upon this prudential plan of clearing away mysteries from Christianity, in order to bring infidels of all descriptions within its pale, I cannot avoid noticing the observations of a writer, whose opinions deserve at least as much respect as those of Mr. Fellowes.—"As to the mysterious articles of our faith, which Infidels would by no means have us forget; 'Who,' say they 'can swallow them?' In truth, none but those who think it no dishonour to their understandings to credit their Creator. Socinus, like our Infidels, was one of a narrow throat; and out of a generous compassion to the Scriptures, (which the world, it seems, had misunderstood for 1500 years,) was for weeding them of their mysteries; and rendering them, in the plenitude of his infallible reason, undisgusting and palatable to all the *rational* part of mankind. *Why should honest Jews and Turks be frightened from us by the Trinity, &c.?* He was for making religion familiar and inoffensive. And so he did; and *unchristian* too."—The same admirable writer subjoins. "Those things which our hands can grasp, our understandings cannot comprehend. Why then deny to the Deity himself, the privilege of being *one amidst that multitude of mysteries* which he has made?" Such are the striking and just reflections of the celebrated Dr. Young, on this important subject, in his *Centaur not Fabulous*; (p. 14.) a work, which in this age of frivolity, voluptuousness and irreligion, I would particularly recommend to the attention of my young reader, promising him in the perusal, not less entertainment from the liveliness of its illustrations and the brilliancy of its wit, than improvement from the soundness of its reasonings and the animation of its piety.

ty very little different from what Jews, Turks, and infidels, have already embraced.

Thus, then, upon the whole, it is manifest, that we have the very essence of Socinianism, presented to us by a writer, in the garb of a Minister of the Established Church: a writer too, who expatiates in every page on the moral virtues; on the virtues of truth, honesty, and fidelity; whilst he openly boasts of the good policy, of continuing in the bosom of that Communion, which he labours to subvert; and exultingly avows his breach of those solemn engagements, by virtue of which he obtained admission within its pale. Such plain and unenlightened Christians, as have not acquired a relish for the refinements, which enable an ingenious casuist to violate his promise and to betray his trust, will be apt to suspect, that in this author's hands, Christianity has not only been abridged of its mysteries, but also curtailed somewhat in its morality. For what do those articles contain, to which every clergyman of the Established Church has declared his *entire and unfeigned assent*, but the very doctrines, which this Gentleman ridicules and rejects? Surely, the doctrines of the *Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, the *Redemption*, and the various other momentous Christian truths, which they pronounce to be indispensable to the formation of a genuine Christian faith, are not to be found comprised in the Sermon on the Mount, which this author maintains to be a "summary of *every thing, which it is necessary to believe or to practise.*"

It is indeed scarcely conceivable, how a person in the possession of a sane understanding can reconcile to himself, subscription to the articles of any Church, and rejection of the doctrines which those articles define. To say, as this author does, that the *sixth* article, in pronouncing, that nothing

is to be received as an article of faith which is not founded in holy writ, supplies a dispensation from the obligation of the rest, is to make as short work with the articles of the Church, as he has already made with the canon of Scripture. Would it not, under these circumstances, have saved much unnecessary trouble, to reduce the articles of the Church to the single declaration of the sixth? Or, indeed, were we to seek the simplicity, which this author so strongly recommends, the sixth article itself must be yet farther reduced, to correspond to the just dimensions of gospel truth; and the whole that our Church should pronounce to be requisite, for the true belief of a Christian teacher, should at once be confined to the range of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. But, to a person not desirous of escaping from the obligations of a solemn engagement, it would naturally occur, that the Church, in propounding certain articles of belief, could never have acted so absurdly, as to superadd to these one paramount article, which was to do away the obligation of all the rest. On the contrary, he would necessarily reason thus: that, whilst certain doctrines are proposed as articles of faith, and it is at the same time declared that none are to be received as such, which are not founded on the authority of Scripture; it is clearly intended to be conveyed, that the articles proposed *are* founded upon that authority, and to be received as articles of faith, by those *only*, who conceive them to be so founded.

The language which Mr. Fellowes's reasoning would put into the mouths of the framers of the articles, is rather whimsical. "*For the purpose of avoiding diversities of opinion, and the establishing of consent touching true religion,*"* we require from

* The *Title* of our articles, in describing the object for which they are framed, uses the very words which are here printed in Italics.

the clergy of the Established Church of England an *unfeigned assent*, to the several doctrines, which we propose; and for the better effecting the aforesaid purpose, we also require of them, each for himself, according to his private interpretation of scripture, to modify or to reject those doctrines, at pleasure; and to introduce such diversities of opinion, as they may respectively think fit.”—This is Mr. Fellowes’s view of the matter. I would suggest to him a view of it somewhat different, in the words of one of the most distinguished ornaments of the English Church at the present day.—“*I do willingly and ex animo subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England*, is the indispensable form of subscription; and therefore it behoves every one, before he offers himself a candidate for holy orders, to peruse carefully the Articles of our Church, and *to compare them with the written word of God*. If, upon mature examination, he believes them to be authorized by Scripture, he may conscientiously subscribe them; but if, on the contrary, he thinks, that he sees reason to dissent from any of the doctrines asserted in them, no hope of emolument or honour, no dread of inconvenience or disappointment, should induce him to express his solemn assent to propositions, which, in fact, he does not believe.”—(Bishop of Lincoln’s Elements, &c. vol. ii. p. 567.)—According to Mr. Fellowes’s reasoning, on the other hand, a Christian minister *may* express his solemn assent to propositions, which, in fact, he does not believe.* And this is the writer who resolves the whole of Christianity into *morality*.

* Dr. Balguy, in speaking of the duties of the clergy, touching the articles, affirms, that “every word that comes from our mouths in opposition to the established faith, is a *violation of the most solemn engagements*, and an act of disobedience to lawful authority.”

Juravi linguâ mentem injuratam gero, is a sentiment which has seldom been so openly avowed, as by this gentleman. The dishonest subterfuge of *mental reservation*, has been often charged upon that Church against whose corruptions it has been the glory of ours to *protest*. It might* now with justice be retorted upon our own, if indeed it could (as I confidently trust it cannot) reasonably be supposed, that opinions on the subject of subscription, similar to those entertained by Mr. F. prevail in any degree amongst the clergy of the Establishment.

But after all, we do not find this gentleman completely satisfied with his own views of the subject. In the wish, which he expresses,† that Parliament should give relief from all subscriptions to doctrine,

* It *has* in truth been retorted, in a late publication, by a Roman Catholic writer, and directed even against those of our clergy, who conceive themselves to be bound by their subscription to consider the articles merely as articles of *peace*. Even of these this author pronounces, that they must be allowed to have acted under impressions “contrary to every principle of Christian sincerity, and favourable to perjury.” What then would the same writer have said of a minister of the Established Church, who, so far from viewing those Articles, to which he had solemnly declared his *unfeigned assent*, as Articles of *peace*, openly arraigns them as grossly *antisciptural*, and professes it to be his determination to oppose and to overturn them by every means in his power?—The passage to which I have referred, is to be found at p. lvi. of the Introduction to a work, entitled *The Protestant Apology for the Roman Catholic Church*.—The author of the Introduction, (who styles himself *Irenæus*) possesses ability and information, worthy of a better cause than that which he has undertaken to support; and many things have fallen from his pen, in that treatise, which well deserve the consideration of Protestant divines.—I mention this the more willingly, because it has not been my lot to meet with publications by any late writer of the Romish Church, alike deserving of notice.

† *Guide to Imm.* vol. i. pp. xviii. xix.

it is manifest, that he is not altogether contented with the *dispensation*, which he conceives the 6th article to supply. Whether Parliament, however, grant such relief or not, his free spirit is not to be restrained.—“When the Church of England got rid of *one* Pope, it never intended to raise up *thirty-nine* in its place.”* (p. xxi.) And if the Church presume to do so, he is at all events released from such iniquitous exercise of authority, by a duty of higher obligation, the duty which he owes to the great spiritual king. (p. xxi—xxiii.) But it may be asked, whether this duty authorizes him to betray his trust, by voluntarily continuing a member of a particular communion, which he labours, in violation of the most solemn engagements, to overturn; labours to overturn, by the very means which his connexion with that communion supplies; and the enjoyment of which means, he pretty plainly intimates to be the principal cause, for which he maintains that connexion. (pp. xix. xx.)

It is, however, but fair to state, that, in this deliberate endeavour to overturn the doctrines which the articles enforce, this author considers himself by no means chargeable with a violation of his engagements. The argument indeed is somewhat new. It amounts to this: that he who attends to the direct, natural, and obvious meaning of the articles, is least likely to arrive at their right con-

* It is curious to observe this advocate for Christian freedom, who spurns with such indignation these Popes which are imposed by the authority of the Church, devising at the same time a pope of his own, to which he would have the whole body of the clergy *compelled* to bend the knee. For, as we have already seen, (note* p. 116.) his favourite plan is, that the ministers of the Establishment should be *COMPELLED* to teach nothing but pure morality. Thus, like most of the other mighty advocates for freedom, the liberty which he wishes for, is merely the liberty to deprive others of theirs.

struction: and that as to the letter, they are in truth more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Whoever doubts this to be a fair representation, may turn to the pages last referred to; and also to p. 33—42. of *Relig. without Cant*, where we find the author more fully unfolding the entire mystery of his reasoning upon this subject;—for *mystery* and *paradox* this author does not dislike, where they are of his own creation. It is there laid down, authoritatively, that the true meaning of the articles is not to be collected from the articles themselves, but from the sense of the clergy at large; who, it is affirmed, “may put *any* construction* upon them

* Dr. Paley, a writer certainly not of the same stamp with Mr. Fellowes, gives a very different account of this matter. “Subscription to Articles of Religion, though no more than a *declaration* of the subscriber’s assent, may properly enough be considered in connexion with the subject of OATHS, because it is governed by the same rule of interpretation; which rule is the *ANIMUS IMPONENTIS*. The enquiry, therefore, concerning subscription, will be *quis imposuit, et quo animo*.”—(*Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, p. 148.)—This is manifestly an enquiry, of a nature very far removed from that which Mr. F. recommends to us. And, although I cannot agree with Dr. Paley either as to his general notion of the *intent* of the articles, or as to his idea, that the *ANIMUS IMPONENTIS* *terminates* with the legislature that enacted them, yet it cannot, I think, be reasonably denied, that he proposes the true *principle* of their interpretation. A just corrective of the laxity, with which Dr. Paley *applies* that principle, may be found in Mr. Gisborne’s *Principles of Moral Philosophy*, p. 190—192. To this work, as well as to the Bishop of Lincoln’s *Elements*, I would earnestly advise the divinity student to resort, for accurate notions upon this subject. Very loose opinions have been scattered abroad, by various writers, upon this point; a point, which of all others demands a most conscientious precision. But of all these writers, none, perhaps, of any note, has advanced a more relaxed system, than the late Cambridge Professor, Dr. Hey, who, in his *Lectures on Divinity*, however much of learning and good sense they may otherwise contain, has certainly merited the charge made by Bishop Law, of leading the members of the church “into all the labyrinths of a loose and a perfidious casuistry.” (Vol. ii. p. 13.)

which they think best:" that, "according to that construction, the articles may and ought to be subscribed:" and that he, who thus subscribes them, inasmuch as he maintains a unity of doctrine with the majority of his brethren, "is a better friend to the Church of England, than he is, who may subscribe the articles in a sense more agreeable to the letter," &c.—Thus we are informed by a writer, who boasts of not submitting his opinions to authority, that we are not to exercise our private judgment in discovering the true sense of the articles, but to take it entirely on trust from others. This however turns out, in the conclusion, to be after all, but a convenient mode of rendering the whole dependant upon the judgment of the very individual, who

His description of the nature of the *tacit repeal* adopted by the church of Geneva, (vol. ii. p. 56.) and his manifest recommendation of it as an example to be followed by other churches, will supply a sufficient proof of the truth of this assertion.—Dr. Powell, again, another eminent member of the University of Cambridge, has given but too much colour, by certain expressions of his in his Discourse on Subscriptions, for the wild opinions of Mr. Fellowes upon this subject: although when well considered, and in connexion with the context, they will be found to give him no support. The following observations of this writer deserve to be quoted. Speaking of the subscription of the *clergy*, he says; "Our articles of Religion are not merely articles of Peace. They are designed also as a test of our opinions. For, since it cannot be imagined, that men should explain with clearness, or enforce with earnestness, or defend with accuracy of judgment, such doctrines as they do not believe: the church requires of those, who are appointed to teach religion, a solemn declaration of their faith. Nor is it more unreasonable to exclude a man from this office, who, through error, unavoidable suppose, and innocent error, is unfit to execute it; than to deny him a civil employment, for which he is accidentally disqualified. He therefore who assents to our articles, must have examined them, and be convinced of their truth."—Dr. Powell's Discourses on various subjects, pp. 33, 34. The whole of this passage is well worthy of attention.

thus modestly disclaims its exercise. For, since all is now to be decided by the suffrage of the clergy, and since there is no practicable contrivance whereby this suffrage can be numerically collected, the sense of the majority must, of course, be precisely that which each individual may *conceive* it to be. But again, as it is not merely “the majority of the living members,” but “particularly the most learned, upright, and judicious members of the Church of England, that constitute that Church;” it must be the sense of the majority of these, it is manifest, that is to determine the point. Now who are the *most learned, upright, and judicious* members of that Church? These clearly *can* be no other than they who reject all *mystery*; who make Christianity nothing but a *moral* rule; who can discern in it nothing more than Dr. Priestley or Mr. Belsham, or any other free expositor who would divest it of all its peculiarities; who, in short, agree with Mr. Fellowes in pronouncing the entire sum and substance of the Christian religion to be comprised in Christ’s Sermon on the Mount. Thus, then, it appears, that our author ends where he began, and that the true meaning of the articles as well as the genuine sense of scripture, is to be collected only from him who has supplied us with *The Guide to Immortality*.

Now what is all this less than insanity? But it is the insanity of a vain mind, of which we see too many instances on religious subjects daily. Well might a periodical writer, whose attachment to religious truth entitles him to general praise, describe this writer as “presumptuous, idolizing his own conceptions, and fancying his own reason infallible, and cutting short the line of faith, exactly where it happens to interfere with their suggestions.—Al-

ready" (it is added*) "he is a latitudinarian in the widest sense of the word: the natural progress is from that to a fanciful self-willed merely nominal Christian; making even the Gospels bend to his own whim. From this point the descent to Deism or even Atheism is perfectly easy: nor do we know indeed that a Deist differs much, except in name, from such a Christian."

Mr. F. has, it is true, congratulated himself on his good fortune, in being the subject of these animadversions of the British Critic; as they have furnished the occasion of his "receiving so much elegance of praise, from one who is equally distinguished by the vigour of his intellect, and the fervour of his benevolence." (Relig. without Cant, pref. p. xxxviii.)—That Dr. Parr has proved his *benevolence*, by the high panegyric which he has bestowed upon Mr. F. there can be no question; but whether he has done equal credit to his *intellect*, or, what is of more consequence, whether he has served the cause of truth and of Christianity by such indulgence of that amiable feeling, is certainly much to be doubted. Had Dr. Parr confined himself to the testimony which he has borne to the purity and benevolence† displayed in the private life

* It should be observed, that these remarks were drawn forth by one of the earliest of this writer's performances. He has since travelled farther in the same direction; and given additional proof of the justice of these animadversions, and the truth of these prognostics.

† Dr. Parr speaks in terms altogether unmeasured of the *benevolent* and *charitable* feelings which uniformly govern the life and guide the pen of Mr. Fellowes. And yet it is an extraordinary effect of those benevolent and charitable feelings, that he should every where throughout his writings pour forth the language of virulence and contempt against all who support the creeds and articles of the Church, against all in short who deem any thing beyond his abridged form of Christianity necessary for a Christian. Perhaps even from the writings of the

of Mr. Fellowes, as he is a competent, so he would have been admitted to be an unexceptionable witness. But, in speaking of an author, whose works are before the public, Dr. Parr, however highly his learning and talents may be (and highly they ought to be) rated, yet cannot possibly expect, that the opinion, which he thinks fit to pronounce upon that author's productions, shall necessarily regulate the public decision. Perhaps, indeed, in the declarations which this classical and most elaborate writer has hazarded on the subject of Mr. Fellowes's theological publications, although nothing can shake his reputation as a scholar, he may not have added much to his character as a divine. For when he tells us, that he finds but "*two or three points of controversial divinity* in which he dissents from Mr. Fellowes," (who in *almost every point* of controversial divinity dissents from the articles of the established Church :) and that he discovers scarcely any thing to be objected to, except "that Mr. F. does not assent to some positions of Mr. Wilberforce*

most illiberal bigot a stronger instance of the want of charity cannot be adduced than that which this author supplies, (as has been noticed, pp. 115, 116.) in speaking of those, who "teach the false and pernicious doctrines of *innate depravity, imputed righteousness,*" &c. In short, it is of a writer, who has war continually in his mouth, that Dr. Parr pronounces peace to be for ever in his heart. It is almost ludicrous to see such a writer represented as using in his own person the language of Grotius, "*Pacem amavi semper amoque,*" even in the qualified sense in which this pacific disposition is described. (Spital Sermon, p. 82.)—Dr. Parr's universal acquaintance with the ancient classics will readily suggest to him whose language I use, when, (without being deterred by the "*tales pacis hostes insurrecturos,*" &c.) I beg to substitute for the foregoing, the following description as more aptly illustrative of the character of his friend.—
Ὡστε ὥτις, αὐτοὺς ζυνάγων, φαίνεσθαι πεφυκεῖν εἰς τὰ μὴτε αὐτοὺς εἶναι ψυχῆαν, μὴτε τὰς ἄλλας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι, ὁρθῶς ἀν' αὐτοῖς.

* Dr. Parr, in speaking of the state of his mind respecting the book published by this excellent man, and sincere Christian.

about original sin; for the attempt to refute whom, some enlightened believers may applaud, and some orthodox churchmen would pardon him;"—when he tells us these things, he proves beyond a doubt, either that he has perused Mr. F's writings with an eye of blameable partiality, where the cause of religious truth demanded an honest search and even a piercing scrutiny; or that his own opinions hang but loosely and uncertainly upon the point of orthodoxy. Dr. Parr needs not to be informed, that the truths of Christianity are not to be conceded even to the amiable sympathies of friendship; nor their just measure and degree to be accommodated to the formation of a polished and a pointed sentence. It were to be wished that in his praises of Mr. F. he had not selected as a mark of his *sense*, his being "a CHRISTIAN WITHOUT BIGOTRY." It certainly, on the other hand, is not to be wondered at, that Mr. Fellowes has returned the compliment, by describing his eloquent encomiast, as "a PRIEST WITHOUT INTOLERANCE AND WITHOUT GUILF."—The reciprocal panegyric might surely have been render-

which gave rise to the strictures of Mr. Fellowes, states, that the description of it lies in the following narrow compass—*τα μεν εξ αρχης, ου μνησμεν; τα δε μεσα, ου συνιημι; τα δε επι πασιν, ου δεικνυμαι.*—Now although there be some opinions in Mr. Wilberforce's work, to which I am as unwilling to apply the *δεικνυμαι* as Dr. Parr can be; yet I cannot help thinking, that it would neither have discredited his *discernment* to have understood the reasoning, nor his taste and piety to have stored his *memory* with many of the results which it contains.—I confess, I think it but a bad symptom of the times, when even grave characters can be found to join in the vulgar ridicule of distinguished piety: when religious seriousness but serves as a ground for ludicrous denominations and sarcastic epithets; and these too not confined to the light and the malevolent, but receiving a partial sanction from the philosopher and the divine, and even admitted with more than toleration in one of the great assemblies, with whose morality and corruption those of the entire people of these nations are vitally interwoven.

ed sufficiently palatable, without the seasoning of illiberal aspersions upon *Christianity* and its *Ptrieshood*.

Dr. Parr, for whose general character and talents, I feel, in common with all who can appreciate integrity and genius, a sincere and unaffected reverence, may think, that I have spoken too strongly upon this subject. But the impress of his praise is no slight matter; and the danger of its giving a circulation to what ought not (and without it perhaps would not) obtain currency with the public, demands an open exposure of the baseness of the coin to which it would attach a fictitious value.

In truth, mischievous as are the publications of Mr. Fellowes, I should not have thought it necessary to animadvert upon them in this place, but that the eloquent eulogies of Dr. Parr, joined to the writer's presenting himself to the public as a clergyman of the Establishment, might, by throwing young readers off their guard as to the true character and object of his works, expose them to be misled by the false lights of a treacherous *Guide*. To such readers, the *satis eloquentiæ, sapientiæ parum*, of the author, is imposing; the specious gloss of liberality and benevolence, which his writings wear, is attractive; the classic authority of his splendid panegyrist is commanding. And, as it was for readers of this description, especially for students in divinity intended for holy orders, that the present work was originally designed, it naturally falls within its province to endeavour to secure them against such snares, when calculated to entrap them into false notions of their duties as professors of a christian faith, or of their engagements as members of a national clergy.

NO. LXXIII.—THE ATONEMENT BY THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST
MORE STRICTLY VICARIOUS, THAN THAT BY THE MOSAIC
SACRIFICES, WHEREBY IT WAS TYPIFIED.

PAGE 51. (c)—The justness of the position, here laid down, will be readily perceived, not only from the observations in pp. 50, 51, of vol. i. but yet more fully from comparing what has been said in Numbers XXXVIII. and XXXIX. on the vicarious *import* of the legal sacrifices, with the remarks in Number XLII. on the true and *essentially vicarious* sacrifice of Christ. The reflexions contained in pp. 271, 272. 300, 301, of vol. i. should be particularly attended to, as pointing out the due *proportion* of the Mosaic and Christian atonements. See also p. 46—48. of vol. i. and Number LXVIII. and p. 46, 47. in Number LXIX.

I subjoin here a very extraordinary paragraph, which I find in a treatise of *Danzius de Ἀνθρώπου Redemptionis humanæ*, on the subject of an admission by the *Jews* of the vicarious suffering of the SON for the sins of men, pursuant to an eternal compact with the FATHER to that end.—“Consentiunt hic nobismet Judæi, scilicet Deum Patrem cum Filio suo jam ab æterno de redimendo humano genere consilium iniisse. Hinc notabilem quendam hæc de re inter Deum et Messiam dialogum per fabulam, fingunt: quem ex Helvico hic apponere placet, qui eundem ex *R. Mos. Haddarschan*, super Gen. i. 3. excerpset, et ita sonat; *Dixit Jehova sanctus Benedictus, Messia juste mi! isti, qui sunt reconditi apud te, hujusmodi erunt, quod futurum, ut peccata eorum inducant te in jugum grave, &c. Respondit coram eo Messias, Domine mundi! Ego quidem lætus suscipio super me tribulationes istas, sive tormenta: eo tamen pacto, ut tu in diebus meis vivifices mortuos, et eos, qui a primo Adamo usque ad illud tempus mortui*

fuert, &c. Dixit ei Sanctus Benedictus, Concedo. Protinus igitur suscepit ex dilectione super se Messias tormenta omnia et tribulationes, sicut scriptum est, Ies. LIII. AFFLICTUS IPSE, ET ANGUSTIATUS EST.”—Meuschen. Nov. Test. ex Talm. p. 850.—This extract I give to the reader as matter of curiosity.

LXXIV. CONCLUDING NUMBER.

PAGE 51. (*d*)—Those objections, the discussion of which would have been improper and impracticable from the pulpit, have been carefully canvassed in the preceding dissertations. It has been the wish of the Author to notice *all* that seemed in any degree deserving of attention. They who are acquainted with the subject, will, it is hoped, do him the justice to allow, that he has omitted none of moment. Whether he has been as successful in their refutation as he has been industrious in their collection, it is with others to judge. This at least he can venture to affirm, that he has examined them with a conscientious regard to Truth and Scripture. And he now concludes this enquiry, with a humble and not unanxious hope, that the word of God may not have suffered in his hands.

APPENDIX,
CONTAINING
AN ACCOUNT
OF THE
UNITARIAN SCHEME,

AS DESCRIBED BY MR. BELSHAM,

IN HIS

REVIEW

OF

MR. WILBERFORCE'S TREATISE;

WITH OCCASIONAL STRICTURES

ON THE LEADING ARGUMENTS ADVANCED IN THAT PUBLICATION.

“Οὕτως ἀταλαιπώρος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐτοιμαῖς μάλλον γρίπνεται.”

Thucyd. p. 15. edit. Franc. 1594.

“I like not that arrogant theology, which presumes to explore what *angels desire to look into*, and which failing in its attempt, rejects as absurd what it is not able to understand.”

Bishop Watson's Charge in 1795.

“Aperte dicite non vos credere Christi Evangelio: nam qui in Evangelio quod vultis creditis, quod vultis non creditis, vobis potius quam Evangelio creditis.”

Aug. cont. Faust. tom. vi. p. 336. ed. 1569.



APPENDIX.



IN supplement to certain remarks in the preceding sheets, (particularly to those in vol. i. pp. 10, 11. 53—67. 113—120. 130—138.) it becomes necessary to exhibit a brief outline of the opinions of that sect, which, under the assumed title of UNITARIAN, has presumed to arrogate the exclusive profession of the *divine unity*; and which has of late years exerted itself, in the sister country, with uncommon zeal and activity, for the subversion of the doctrines and the establishment of the national religion.

An abstract, presenting at one view, the leading principles and consequences of the system, divested of the imposing phraseology, which writers of modern days know so well how to apply to all objects whether worthy or unworthy, may prove not less beneficial to some who have, than to others, who have not, embraced its doctrines. The task indeed is not without its difficulty. To seize what is fugitive: to fix that which is ever in the act of change: to chain down the Proteus to one form, and to catch his likeness ere he has shifted to another:—this is certainly a work not easy to be accomplished. What Unitarianism, however, was in the year* 1798, a writer, who professes himself its faithful inter-

* This appendix was originally drawn up in the year 1800. What have been the wanderings of the fugitive since that period, the Author has had little leisure, and less inclination, to explore. He is also disposed to think, that full as much consequence has been already attached to the subject, as it is entitled to.

preter and vindicator, has circumstantially detailed. Mr. Belsham, the late theological teacher at Hackney, has *ex officio* announced the creed of the day: and, so far as the principle of dissent can admit concurrence, the doctrines which he has promulged, may reasonably be presumed, to be those generally received by the Dissenters of the Unitarian denomination throughout the Sister Country.

The scheme, as presented by this writer, in his Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Enquiry, is briefly as follows. Beginning with the existence of "an infinitely powerful, wise, and good being, as the first and fundamental principle of rational religion," he pronounces the essence of this being to be *love*: and from this he infers, as a demonstrable consequence, that none of the creatures formed by such a being, "will ever be made eternally miserable." To suppose the contrary, he maintains, is not only inconsistent with the divine benevolence, but directly contradictory to the plainest principles of justice. That all will rise again after death, he admits to have been taught by Christ: and he likewise admits, that "the wicked will be raised to suffering." But, since God would act *unjustly* in inflicting "eternal misery for temporary crimes; the sufferings of the wicked can be but remedial, and will terminate in a complete purification from moral disorder, and in their ultimate restoration to virtue and happiness;"* or, as he elsewhere† expresses it, "Moral evil must be expelled by the application of natural evil;" and if not fully effected in this life, "the process must be carried on by the severer sufferings of a future retribution."—Thus the doctrine of a *purgatory*‡ stands immoveably fixed on the basis of

* Review, &c. p. 12—16.

† Pp. 41, 42.

‡ See beside the above references, p. 154.

the Divine justice : and the antithesis between *eternal* misery and *temporary* crimes, is made to complete the demonstration of the Unitarian ; by which, he is not only enabled, to communicate “confidence” and “tranquillity” to the “enlightened and virtuous believer ;”^{*} but, he might have also added, a hardened and fearless security to the impenitent offender : and without this, he contends, “the God of nature must be viewed as frowning over his works, and like a merciless tyrant, dooming his helpless creatures to eternal misery,” &c.[†]—Whoever desires to see this curious specimen of reasoning fully examined and exposed, will find ample satisfaction in Mr. Walker’s Letter to Mr. Belsham : p. 40—42.

Having thus softened down the article of judicial retribution, and lightened guilt of most of its terrors, as well as of much of its deformity, (there being, as he contends, “a preponderance of virtue, even in characters contaminated with the grossest vice ;”[‡]) he naturally proceeds to depreciate the value of the *atonement by Christ*.—The notion of his death, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men, Mr. B. totally rejects : and the doctrine of redemption through his blood, he holds to be an entire mistake, founded in the misunderstanding of certain phrases peculiar to the Jews :§ and finally for the full establishment of his opinions, he refers us to Dr. J. Taylor ; the amount of whose reasoning on this head, “in his *admirable Key*,”|| as Mr. B. finds convenient to call it, has been already examined at large, in the foregoing work, especially vol. i. pp. 138—143. 152, 153. 245—254.

* P. 21.

† P. 20.

‡ Pp. 14. 38, 39, 40. 42.

§ Pp. 17, 18. 105, 106.

|| In a periodical publication, distinguished for the uprightness and talent with which it is conducted, there is to be found

The merits and the sufferings of Christ having, in the scheme of this writer, no connexion with the acceptance of man; the notion of his divine nature, and even that of his pre-existence, are discarded as wild chimeras. Jesus Christ he considers “as a man *in all respects* like to his brethren;” and he seems particularly anxious, that the opinions of the Unitarian should not be confounded with those of Socinus; who, he says, whilst he properly maintains, “that Jesus had no existence before his birth, yet admits the unscriptural and most incredible notion, that since his resurrection, he has been advanced to the government of the universe.”* The father of Socinianism had but half accomplished the work of degrading the Son of God, whilst he allowed him a superiority over the human kind after death. Mr. B. with strict consistency, completes the system; and boldly contends, that as he differed in no respect from man in his mode of coming into the

a series of valuable letters, upon the subject of the work above alluded to: and in the conclusion, the writer observes as follows, upon this “*admirable Key*.”—“The key of this author is not, I am persuaded, the legitimate one. I should rather be tempted to resemble it to some of those false keys, vulgarly called picklocks.—The web of the key, to speak technically, is, in those ingenious instruments cut to as *slender a form* as is consistent with the strength necessary for turning the bolt, in order that the chance of the impediment from the wards may be as little as possible. But the lock, with which this theological adventurer had to do, was of such a peculiar construction, as to resist every effort to open it, except with the true key. The Doctor gave some desperate wrenches, and doubtless imagined that he had effected his purpose when he found the key turn in his hand. But it has been discovered by others, that he did no more than break it in the lock, and the bolt, for any thing which he has done to remove it, remains where it was before.”—Christ. Observ. vol. vi. p. 504.—The figure undoubtedly conveys no unjust idea of the work, which it is so much the fashion with Socinian writers, and with good reason, to extol.

* P. 74.

world, so can he have no dominion or superiority over him in the world of spirits. That he "is indeed now alive, and employed in offices the most honourable and benevolent," he does not attempt to deny: but, since "*we are totally ignorant of the place where he resides, and of the occupations in which he is engaged,*" he maintains, that "there can be no proper foundation for religious addresses to him, nor of gratitude for favours now received, nor yet of confidence in his future interposition in our behalf."* Thus, because we are ignorant of the *place* and *occupations* of the Son of God, is all intercourse between man and his Redeemer at an end! Thus says Mr. Belsham. And so far is he from considering our blessed Lord as an object of religious address, that he can look on him only as the "most excellent of *human* characters, the most eminent of all the prophets of God;" whose "memory he reveres," whose "doctrine he embraces," in whose "promises he confides, and to whose authority he bows."†

To what then does christianity amount, on Mr. Belsham's plan? To nothing more than good habits; and these habits, the result of man's own unaided and independent exertions, or rather the result of external influences and irresistible impressions.‡ Those usually received, and (as Mr. Wilberforce properly styles them) *peculiar* doctrines of christianity, which declare the *corrupted state of human nature*, the *atonement of the Saviour*, and the *sanc-tifying influence of the Holy Spirit*, our author rejects as utterly inconsistent with truth and scripture.§ The preponderance of virtue over vice in the world at large, and with a very few, if any exceptions, in

* P. 85.

† Pp. 84, 85.

‡ P. 170—175.

§ P. 170.

every individual in particular, he maintains to be indisputable.* The practice of virtue, he pronounces to be the only ground of acceptance with God, without any regard to faith in Christ, to his merits or his sufferings, all which he proscribes as notions unscriptural and absurd:† and as to the influence of the holy spirit being that which prompts to virtue, he finds little difficulty in expunging this likewise from his creed, being fully satisfied, “that the scriptures do not teach the existence of any such person as the Holy spirit, and that there is no ground for the expectation of any supernatural operation on the mind.”‡ The sole incitements to virtuous conduct, spring, according to Mr. B. from “the circumstances in which men are placed, and the impressions to which they are exposed:”—“moral and religious habits, not being acquired in any different way, from other habits of mind:”§—that is, according to his reasoning, all being equally the result of a *necessary* operation: the religious tendency, as well as its opposite, naturally arising out of a certain “state of the brain;”|| and “habits growing by the influence of particular impressions with the same regularity and certainty, with which the fruits of the earth are produced and matured by the genial influence of the sun, and of the fructifying showers.”¶

Thus does the advocate of human *merit* vindicate the *independency* of human virtue. Let us stop for a moment to examine this more fully.—“Virtue** is

* Pp. 13, 14. 38. 39. † Pp. 104, 105. 172, 173.

‡ P. 97.—See also pp. 70, 71. 76, 77, 78, 79.

§ Pp. 134. 148. 173. 180. || P. 171.

¶ Pp. 174, 175.—Also p. 41.

** Mr. B. in his *Elements*, where it is his intention to convey his ideas in the most scientific form, defines virtue to be, “the tendency of an action, affection, habit or character, to the ultimate happiness of the agent.” (p. 371.) It is at the same time to be noted, that of this tendency the true and proper judge

a system of habits, conducing to the greatest ultimate happiness :”* “and men being the creatures of circumstances, the habits they form, whether good or bad, are the result of the impressions to which they are exposed;”†—or, as we have just seen, are the result of a *necessary* and *mechanical* operation, and arise out of causes independent of the agent, if such he can be called. Now it seems natural to demand of this writer, in what respect his scheme differs from that part of the high doctrines of Calvin, which he most strongly reprobates? Does he not equally with the reformer of Geneva, contend that man has nothing which he can call his

is the agent himself. What then follows? Why plainly this, as Dr. Price has properly objected, that agreeably to this definition, “any the most pernicious and horrible effects will become just and fit to be produced by any being, if but the minutest degree of clear advantage or pleasure may result to him from them.” (Review of Morals, p. 183.) Now how does Mr. Cooper, who coincides in Mr. Belsham’s sentiments, reply to this? “Granted. But *let God look to that*. A future state of retribution has been ascertained for the very purpose of obviating this objection.” Mr. B. indeed admits, that “the expression is harsh, and hardly consistent with the reverence due to the Supreme Being;” but contends that “the meaning is just, and the reply satisfactory.”—What! a *retribution* hereafter! Wherefore a *retribution*? Must a being whose only business was to *calculate* the balance of advantage, suffer for a mistake in that calculation, when he made it with a view to that which alone he was bound to look to, his own advantage? And this too, when he could not by any possibility have made a different calculation. For, as Mr. B. informs us, (Elements, p. 391.) “the *only* difference between the most virtuous and the most vicious person is, that the former was placed in circumstances, and exposed to impressions which *generated* virtuous habits and affections, and the latter in circumstances by which vicious principles and dispositions were produced :” the one so circumstanced as that he *must unavoidably calculate right*, and the other so circumstanced as that he *must unavoidably calculate wrong*.—So much for the true distinction between virtue and vice.

* P. 38.

† P. 41.

own? Does he not, equally with him, reduce every action under the necessary and irresistible controul of motives, in which the agent has no choice, and over which he can have no power? And does he not, whilst he thus concurs with the follower of Calvin, differ from himself, by abolishing the very idea of merit, whilst he makes merit the foundation of his system?

Mr. B. indeed, exerts all his ingenuity, as Doctor Priestley had done before,* to escape from this resemblance to the Calvinist. The attempt however is vain. The Unitarian may fancy, that he has provided a complete salvo for the difficulties of his system, and a clear distinction from that of the Calvinist, by substituting his notion of a *purgatory* for that of *eternal punishment*. But here, the consequences with which he presses the Calvinist, return upon himself. For, if it be inconsistent with "infinite justice and goodness to doom a being to *eternal misery*, for no other cause, but that of not extricating himself out of the state in which his creator placed him, without any power to act or will;"† I would ask, by what principles of reasoning it can be reconciled to the same infinite justice and goodness, to doom to *temporary misery*, a being placed in circumstances precisely similar; *i. e.* determined to one certain mode of action, by an indissoluble chain of motives, and an irresistible necessity. If the idea of *punishment* for that which was the result of inevitable necessity, be repugnant to the essential nature of *justice*, it must be equally so, whether that punishment be of long or of short duration. The *quantity* of the evil endured, if no evil *whatever* ought to be inflicted, can make no change in the nature of the case. The Power that prolongs or

* Philosoph. Necessity, sect. xiii.

† Review, p. 58.

heightens the punishment, where *no* punishment was deserved, may be more malignant, but cannot be more unjust. Thus then, allowing to the Unitarian the full benefit of his *purgatorial** scheme (for which however scripture supplies not the smallest foundation;) he is exposed, equally with the Calvinist, to the charge, which he himself brings against the latter, of “impeaching the character of

* The formal notion of a *purgatory*, I find laid down by our author, in the *philosophical* treatise before alluded to, in which it is his professed object to give to students, accurate and fundamental notions, on all the leading subjects of morality and religion. That the precision of his ideas may not suffer in the reporting, I shall state them in his own words. “If there be a future life, the immediate condition of the great mass of mankind when they enter upon it, must be a state of very considerable pain and suffering. For the great majority of human characters are alloyed with one or more vicious habits and affections. *These must be put under a process of cure, more or less severe in proportion to the malignity of the moral disease.*”—*Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind*, p. 402. Our author also affirms that he has the testimony of scripture for this doctrine. I apprehend it must be the *second Maccabees*, where *others* have pretended to find it also. Or, perhaps, as he has not joined in turning the doctrine to so good account as those who profess to have found it there, his authority has been of that classical nature which might better suit a philosopher.

“Ergo exercentur pœnis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt: aliæ panduntur inanes
Suspensæ ad ventos; aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni.
Quisque suos patimur Manes.”

ÆN. lib. vi.

“For this are various penances enjoined;
And some are hung to bleach upon the wind;
Some plunged in waters, others plunged in fires,
Till all the dregs are drained, and all the rust expires.
All have their Manes, and those Manes bear.”

DRYDEN.

Pagans, Jews, Mahometans and Papists have heretofore held these notions: to these we must now add the *Philosophical Unitarian*.

his maker and traducing his works.”*—Thus much for the *consequences* of the two systems.

Again, as to the *principle* of necessity, it is precisely the same, whether the Unitarian endeavour to signify it, by the title of *philosophical*; or degrade it, by that of *predestinarian*. Or, if Mr. Belsham will still pretend to differ from the follower of Calvin, whom he describes as equally with himself, pronouncing man a *necessary* instrument destitute of self agency, it can only be in this; that whilst the latter makes man a *necessary* instrument in the hand of God, Mr. B’s. system admits the possibility of rescuing him from this slavish subjection to his Maker, by placing him under the irresistible controul of *chance*, or *destiny*, or some other *equally* conceivable power. For, to suppose all the actions of man to spring necessarily from motives, and these motives the unavoidable result of external impressions and local circumstances; the divine spirit giving no direction in the particular case, and the man having no power either to regulate their operation or to resist their impulse: is to suppose all that the Stoic, and the Atheist, could desire.

Such is the exalted *merit* of man, fashioned by the deistical jargon of that, which equally disgraces christianity, and philosophy, by assuming their names. Such are the lights afforded us by the *Rational* Christian: who mends Calvinism by Purgatory; secures to man a property in his actions, by rendering him the unresisting slave of motives; and maintains the interests of religion, by subjecting human conduct solely to the mechanical operations of secondary causes.

It is indeed extremely difficult to make out Mr. Belsham’s system. But it is one of the advantages

* *Review*, p. 37.

of inconsistency, that the statement of the absurdities in one part of an argument, is liable to be discredited by contradictory positions in another.—Thus, whilst Mr. B. repeatedly affirms, that man is not to look to the influence and sustaining aid of the divine spirit, but solely to his own exertions, or as he most singularly explains these exertions, to circumstances and impressions which work upon his mind by a mechanical and necessary operation; he professes, in other places, not altogether to banish the notion of the divine agency. We are, he says, “thankfully to ascribe all our improvements, our hopes and our consolations to God.”* Mr. B. has here struck a little out of the path to direct Atheism, in which he seemed before rapidly advancing: and this saving clause was indispensable to a writer, who professes a belief in the existence of a God. But when we come to enquire, on what ground our gratitude is due to a Being, who has not contributed by any beneficial influence to the improvement of our virtue, we find our independence of a divine grace still carefully secured, inasmuch as the sole foundation of our thankfulness to the Supreme Being, is, that “to his appointment, and continued agency, all causes owe their efficacy.”* It is then, for the original constitution and general arrangement of the works of nature alone that we are to be grateful: and not for any special operation of a divine influence, in any individual case. May we not therefore fairly apply to our philosopher, what Cicero pronounced of the refiners of ancient times, “*verbis reliquisse Deos, re sustulisse?*”

But, that we may the more perfectly understand our author's meaning, he supplies us with a specimen of the mode, in which a judicious instructor

* P. 175.

† Pp. 175, 180.

should endeavour to reclaim a vicious person, desirous of reformation. Having first carefully guarded him against all unscriptural doctrines, such as *original sin, atonement, merits of Christ*, and the like: having warned him, not to expect any supernatural impressions upon his mind, nor to imagine that moral and religious habits are to be acquired in a way different from any other: having pointed his attention particularly, to those parts of scripture, which direct him to *do justice, to love mercy, &c.*: having urged him to fix in his mind, just and honourable sentiments of God, as the greatest, wisest and best of beings:”—he proceeds more circumstantially, to the case of the offender; and beginning in due form, with a *definition* of Virtue, as a course of conduct leading to the greatest ultimate happiness;” and of Vice, as “that which leads to misery:”—he next lays before the sinner, (or in the milder vocabulary of Mr. B. the “person oppressed by the tyranny of evil habits”†) the exact state of his case. “You are deficient in virtuous habits, you wish to form them: you have contracted vicious affections, you wish‡ to exterminate them. You

* P. 174.

† P. 172.

‡ N. B. It is above all things necessary for the reformation of this person “oppressed by the tyranny of evil habits,” (so alarming and fanatical a phrase as that of *sinner* I must not use,) that he feel *no remorse*, be the vicious acts that he has committed ever so enormous. For Mr. Belsham informs us. in his *Elements*, (pp. 307. 406.) that “the doctrine of philosophical necessity *supersedes* remorse.” And indeed it is happy that it does so; because, whilst on the one hand, he pronounces remorse *not to be essential* to repentance; he proves on the other, that it is a thing in itself *highly pernicious*; inasmuch as it is “founded upon the belief, that in the same previous circumstances it was possible to have acted otherwise.”—A perfect freedom from uneasiness of mind, after the murder of a parent, or the seduction of the innocent; and undisturbed composure, flowing from the conviction that under all the circumstances it

know the circumstances, in which your vicious habits were originally contracted, and by which they have been confirmed. Avoid* these circumstances *and give the mind a contrary bias*. You know what impression will produce justice, benevolence, &c. *Expose your mind repeatedly and perseveringly to the influence of these impressions*, and the affections themselves will gradually rise, and insensibly improve, &c. *ALL that is required, is judgment, resolution, time, and perseverance !!!*"†—Really, Mr. B. must excuse me, if I take the liberty of say-

was impossible to have acted otherwise, must surely contribute much to accelerate the repentance of the offender, and to complete his reformation!

* This is a whimsical sort of address, from a writer, who, upon his principle of *necessity*, maintains the impossibility of avoiding, upon the recurrence of similar circumstances, any act which has once been performed. For if this be, as he contends it is, (Elements, &c. p. 107.) a sufficient reason for asserting, that the person who has once yielded to any temptation, *must* under the like circumstances yield to it again, and that consequently the only chance for his escape is to be found in flight: it must likewise be a sufficient reason for concluding, that he who has not at one time been able to fly from the circumstances which brought the temptation, will not be able to fly from them at another; the circumstances at the time of the intended flight, being the same as before: and thus the impossibility recurs ad infinitum.—Our writer had condemned Mr. Godwin, (Elements, &c. p. 405.) for the indiscreet avowal of the consequences of this system; namely, that *necessary agents are incapable of moral discipline*. But has not Mr. B. himself, as completely disclosed the secret by his reasoning? For, if a *necessary agent* can never acquire an increase of strength, to resist the temptations of vice, where is the improvement in moral discipline? This *Parthian* moralist, who is to be for ever unequal to the *παραδιν υσμινη*, and can hope to conquer only by flying, will find that he will not have much to boast of in the way of conquest, if his steed is to be as much fettered in the flight, as he is himself manacled in the conflict. Alas! that Mr. B. will not permit his penitent, to call to his aid, that auxiliary, and that armour, which would enable him to *quench all the fiery darts of the wicked*!

† Pp. 174, 175.

ing, that I know nothing in the English language to equal this, except the *Energies of Miss Bridgetina Botherim*.* It is not my intention to introduce ludicrous ideas upon such a subject: but the resemblance is too striking and apposite to be overlooked.

So far as Mr. Belsham's language is intelligible, his process of conversion amounts to this. He tells the vicious person, that he has contracted bad habits; and he desires him by all means to get rid

* *Modern Philosophers*:—a work, which if perused with feelings favourable to religion and order, must be allowed to furnish a decisive proof, that Mrs. Hannah More is not the only female of the present day, by whom zeal and talents have been eminently displayed, in defence of all that can be deemed valuable in this life, and in that which is to come.

Were we, in truth, to search out among the authors of later times, for those who have most successfully promoted the cause of virtue and religion, by the combination of what is most interesting with what is most edifying in their writings, we should find them to have been principally of the other sex. With the name of Mrs. Hannah More, who ranks eminent in that class—and whose numerous and diversified publications, scattering their benefits through every gradation of society from the prince down to the peasant, have come home to the breasts of all with that irresistible force that springs from the united powers of piety and genius—we have to connect in grateful remembrance, the names of Hamilton, of Bowdler, of West, of Chapone, and (notwithstanding something that one could wish to be otherwise) of Barbauld. To “the venerable Elizabeth Carter and the blooming Elizabeth Smith,” we have also to cast our eyes; if, in Mrs. More's words, we would “contemplate profound and various learning chastised by true Christian humility; and if we would wish to dwell on the recollection of “acquirements, which would have been distinguished in a University, meekly softened and beautifully shaded by the gentle exertion of every domestic virtue, the unaffected exercise of every feminine employment.” (Cœlebs, pp. 250, 251.)—Did my present subject lead me merely to advert to the distinction, which superior talents, exquisite taste, and the charms of fine composition, confer upon the female writers of the present day, it would be impossible to overlook the commanding claims of Miss Edgeworth.

of them. How far this salutary advice and direction would operate to the reformation of the sinner, they who may have been reclaimed from vicious courses by such means, can best say. But one thing deserves particularly to be remarked, that whilst the mind of the sinner, is directed to contemplate the excellence of virtue, to excite its own energies, to expose itself to impressions, and the like; not one word escapes of the propriety of *prayer*; on the contrary, all supplication for divine assistance seems to be expressly excluded, and indeed evidently must be so, on Mr. Belsham's principles. For, if goodness be the *necessary* result of impressions and circumstances, the mechanical effect of particular traces on the brain, derived from the general operation of established and unalterable laws of our constitution; there is no room, in the particular case, for divine interference. We may, according to Mr. B's principles, indulge in sentiments of complacency to that first cause, the beneficial effects of whose original arrangement we feel in the individual instance, but *prayer* addressed to the divine being, can have no rational object. Prayer, accordingly, forms no part of this writer's system. In no one line of his work does he recognize it as a Christian duty:—indeed the mention of it has not once escaped him.

It is not then surprising that we should find Mr. B. endeavouring to diminish the opportunities and inducements to prayer by contending, that the Christian religion has not prescribed the appointment of a day, for the purposes of divine worship. But he goes farther. He affirms that “Christianity expressly abolishes every such distinction of days:” * that, “under the Christian dispensation every day

* Review, p. 20.

is alike; no one more holy than another: that whatever employment or amusement, is lawful or expedient upon any one day of the week, is equally lawful and expedient on any other day:”* that, consequently, “a virtuous man is performing his duty to the Supreme Being, as really, and as acceptably, when he is pursuing the proper business of life, or even when enjoying its innocent and decent amusements, as when he is offering direct addresses to him, in the closet, or in the temple.”† From these premises he peremptorily concludes, that all distinctions of days should be exploded: that our business, and our amusements should be pursued on every day alike: and that the laws which enjoin the observance of the Sabbath are “unreasonable and unjust.”‡ He likewise maintains that the Sabbatical spirit naturally leads to uncharitable and censorious feelings:§ that “persons who are *so very religious* on a Sunday,” (as to make regular attendance on the services of the church as a matter of conscience) “are too apt to lay aside religion for the rest of the week:”|| and that, upon the whole, the Sabbatical observance is highly injurious to the cause of Virtue. To this pernicious institution, our author does not scruple to attribute the decrease of national morality: and he rejoices, with a *Christian joy*, that the late “ill-advised” proposition, “for enforcing a stricter observation of the Lord’s day,” was wisely rejected by the Legislature.¶

Now, it may perhaps occur to a plain unphilosophical reader to enquire, what sort of a teacher of Christianity is this, who thus levels Christ, through the *whole* of his existence to the rank of human nature:—leaves man, for acceptance, to his own me-

* Pp. 20. 139. † P. 133. ‡ Pp. 140, 141.
§ P. 141. || P. 142. ¶ P. 203.

rit; and that *merit* the pure result of external impressions, and mechanical operation:—rejects the notion of prayer,* making man as it were indepen-

* How different are the reflections of true philosophy, guided by a pious reverence for the superior lights of Revelation! The words of a distinguished and attractive writer, whose publications have always tended to promote, what his life has uniformly exemplified, the love and practice of virtue, are too interesting and important to be omitted on this subject.—“ If we admit the truth of revelation, the evidence which it delivers of the *special interposition of God*, in the physical and moral government of the world, must be deemed *decisive*. Instead, therefore of involving ourselves in the mazes of metaphysical subtilty, let us direct our attention to the foundation of that intercourse with the Deity, which is at once the most interesting duty, and the noblest privilege of our nature. We are taught that *he who cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him*: that *in him we live, and move, and have our being*: that *as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him*: that *if we, being evil, know how to give good gifts to our children, how much more shall our father, which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him*. For this thing, says St. Paul, *I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me*: And our Saviour is recorded to have prayed the *third time, saying the same words, O! my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: Nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt*. Indeed the form of devotion, which Christ recommended to his disciples, affords the clearest proof that he regarded prayer as an acceptable and efficacious act. Nor is this supposition inconsistent with that immutability of the divine attributes, which is essential to their nature and perfection. The wisdom, benevolence, and justice of the Deity are *the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever*. But this unchangeableness implies, that in their exercise they are always accommodated to the purest rectitude, and to the greatest sum of felicity. And thus a providence is established, which discriminates between the virtuous and the vicious; which adapts the properest means to the accomplishment of the best ends; and regulates all things so as to work together for the highest good. To this superintending direction a pious christian will look up, with humble confidence, *for ease under suffering, for protection in danger, and consolation in sorrow*. If prayer were not enjoined, as a duty, he would instinctively perform it as a refuge for human infirmity. And he may reasonably presume, that such filial dependence will be indulgently accepted by his

dent of his Maker :—and finally, proscribes the Sabbath as *destructive of Religion and Morality*? Mr. B. being aware that such a question would naturally suggest itself, has been careful to supply the answer. He tells us, that he desires to be considered, as a “Moral teacher of Christianity.”* And, lest we might not perfectly understand the nature of this *Moral* or *Unitarian* Christianity which he

heavenly father, who in his divine administration is characterized as being ever ready to *bind up the broken in heart*; to *heal the wounded in spirit*; and to *give good gifts to them that worthily ask him*.” FATHER’S INSTRUCTIONS—Part the Third—by Thos. Percival, M. D. p. 118—120. I the more willingly refer to this excellent performance, because, independent of the value of the passage here extracted, and the vein of fervent piety which pervades the entire volume, the observations which it contains on the subject of the *Divine permission of Evil*, the topics it suggests for the farther confirmation of the *Evidences of Christianity*, and the directions it conveys for the due regulation of the *Clerical conduct and character*, entitle it to the most serious perusal from every friend to religion and virtue.

Since the date of the first edition of this work, the revered person, spoken of in the above note, has paid the last debt of nature; and has gone to receive in another state, the reward of the piety and virtues which distinguished him in this.—To offer any general remarks here upon the life and character of a man so estimable and so esteemed, would be little worthy of a subject whose magnitude and interest entitle it to the most ample consideration. To the memory of this venerated friend, I have already elsewhere offered a humble tribute. And happily, as preserving to society a valuable light, a complete memoir of his life and writings has been given to the public, by his son, Doctor Edward Percival, now of Dublin.—This memoir, prefixed to the entire collection of Doctor Percival’s works, must be too well known and too justly appreciated, to render it necessary for me to enlarge upon the fidelity and ability with which it has been executed. The spirit which it breathes, and the talent which it exhibits, conspire to afford the happiest presage, that the son will prove himself, through life, not unworthy of the father, whose endowments, whose attainments, and whose excellencies, he has recorded.

* P. 227.

teaches, he informs us that it is *substantially* the same, with the system of Lepaux, and the Theophilanthropes of France. This is a fair and candid account of the matter. The same title, which they can produce to the denomination of Christians, Mr. B. can undoubtedly advance. Indeed, his must be allowed to be yet stronger: for, though, as he observes, their common principle is a belief in the existence, perfection, and providence of God, and in the doctrine of a future life: and their rule of morals, love to God, and good will to men;" and thus, as he remarks, their "professed principles *comprehend the essence of the Christian religion*: yet, in not admitting the resurrection of Christ, the Theophilanthropists deprive themselves of the only solid ground, on which to build the hope of a future existence."* Thus we see, in one short view, the nature of Mr. Belsham's Unitarian scheme, and its advantage over that of the French Theophilanthropes. He not only holds, in common with them, the above mentioned *essential principles of Christianity*; but he also maintains, in addition, that a *man* has actually risen from the dead: the admission of which *fact* into the creed of the Theophilanthropes, he candidly confesses, would have left his scheme no superiority over theirs; inasmuch as, *by laying a solid ground for their doctrine of a future life*, it would have rendered their system perfectly complete.

But seriously, are these the doctrines of that sect, who call themselves *Unitarians*, in the sister country: or are they erroneously ascribed to them by Mr. Belsham? Indeed, if we are to judge from the applause bestowed on Mr. B's performance by writers of that denomination in England, we have

* P. 217.

reason to think that he has given a fair representation. Now, if he has, it surely seems unworthy of men, who exult in the open and fearless avowal of their opinions, to trifle with the name of *Christian*; and if he has not, it is full time, that they should throw back Mr. B's doctrines, on himself, and his Theophilanthrope associates. I am most willing to admit, that no person has a right to deny to Mr. B. the appellation of a "Moral teacher." To this he is fully entitled, as having a firm belief in the existence and *general* providence of God; and as inculcating principles, that tend to beget love and gratitude to that Being, and to produce a corresponding benignity of affection to our fellow creatures, impressing the duties of benevolence and social kindness to man, as I make not the smallest question, he truly feels them. But, whilst thus much is freely admitted; surely Mr. B. cannot reasonably be offended if he should be denied the appellation of a "*teacher of Christianity?*" For what is Christianity? Is it any thing differing from the natural religion of the Deist? And if differing; is it in doctrines, or in precepts? Not in doctrines, according to Mr. B. for he asserts again and again, that it has none *peculiar*. Is it in precepts? No, says Mr. B. for the pure and simple scheme of the Theophilanthrope, who rejects revelation, "*comprehends the essence of Christianity.*" And has, then, Jesus Christ passed as a mute, across the great stage of human affairs? And shall we denominate ourselves from him, who has taught us nothing different from what we knew before? No, says Mr. B. this is not so: by his rising from the dead, he has *proved to us the certainty of a future life.*—Is this then Christianity?—Of this, Mr. B. may be an excellent teacher: but in such Christianity, his instructions will, I

trust, ever be confined to a very small number indeed.

And is Mr. B. displeased with Mr. Wilberforce, for calling this a "sort of halfway-house between orthodoxy and infidelity?" I cannot but think, that most people of plain sense and candid minds, who have not been visited by any rays of modern illumination, will rather be of opinion, that Mr. W. has erred, in not advancing this mansion a little beyond the middle point. Nor is this without countenance from Mr. B. himself, since he confesses, that "of the two he would rather approach the confines of cold and cheerless scepticism, than the burning zone of merciless orthodoxy:"* by which last it must be observed, he understands the principles of Christianity, as held by the established church; *merciless* being merely the ordinary adjunct to the character of every established priesthood.

On this subject, Mr. B. exhibits rather an unfortunate specimen, of that calm and softened charity, which distinguishes and adorns the temperate region, where he rejoices to find himself placed, in a happy medium between the two above mentioned "ineligible extremes." A want of integrity, a disregard of truth, "indolence, pride, and bitter zeal against all those who oppose the doctrines of the public creed," he represents as the never failing consequences, of an established religion, "whether true or false:" the unvarying characteristics of "an established priesthood." Such a body, he contends, "is, in its very nature, a persecuting order." "All breathe the same fiery and intemperate spirit." Truth and honest enquiry they are paid to discountenance and repress.† "Interested priests and crafty statesmen will continue to support a religious

* P. 263.

† P. 199.

establishment, which answers their private and political purposes, at the same time that they hold its doctrines in contempt.”* The object, to which these observations are intended more immediately to apply, Mr. B. does not leave his reader at a loss to discover, when he plainly affirms, that the heads of *our* establishment, look to means very different from that of “a sincere faith in” their own “creeds and homilies, for the prosperity of the national church:”†—and with the same liberal reference it is, that he reminds us of the saying of Cicero, “that he wondered how augur could meet augur without laughing:” and again, of that memorable exclamation of Leo, in the days of papal Rome, “how lucrative is this fable of Jesus Christ!”‡—thus clearly intimating, what a warm supporter of his doctrines and his performance has since announced in terms a little more direct; “it is well known that many of our public teachers laugh in their sleeves,—and some of these sleeves, they say are of *lawn*,—at those doctrines, which they inculcate from the pulpit, with a pretended earnestness.”§

Nor does Mr. Belsham confine his charges to those, who are the immediate superintendents of the national *religion*. Though particularly favoured with Mr. B’s notice, they do not entirely engross it. By his observations on the institution of a national fast,|| he takes care to hold up the civil, no less than the ecclesiastical heads of the state, as objects of public contempt, and execration, for their gross insincerity, and unprincipled imposition on the people. Now, if all this be of the nature of that charity, which belongs to the middle region, under

* Pp. 230. 233. † P. 220. ‡ P. 230.

§ Layman’s Letters to Mr. Wilberforce on the doctrine of Hereditary Depravity, p. 172.

|| Review, pp. 204, 205.

whose temperate influence, Mr. B. professes to enjoy philosophic repose ; I rather apprehend, that the inhabitant of this “pleasant and commodious dwelling,” is as far removed from the *charity*, as he boasts to be from the *peculiar doctrines*, of *Christianity*.

It must indeed be confessed, that great allowance is to be made for those, who have been as it were rocked in the very cradle of discontent : and who have been used from infancy, to view every act of the Government, and every ordinance of the Church, with the bitterness of a discomfited and vindictive enemy. But it is strange, that whilst language of the nature here cited, every where deforms Mr. B's pages, and those of his Unitarian associates, they should make the *want of charity*, the principal charge against all, who hold Christianity in any other, than the vague, and fleeting form, in which they profess to embrace it. In the management of a controversy, it may not indeed be bad policy, to charge the adversary with whatever unfair arts, you mean to resort to yourself. Thus, whilst the opposite party bears all the odium, you possess yourself of the profit. So at least it seems to be with the writers of Mr. B's way of thinking. A total want of candour and charity is perpetually objected to all, who defend the rectitude of the national religion ; whilst every principle of both is grossly violated by those who oppose it :—and at the same time that the charge of self-interest, is freely bestowed upon such as support the establishment ; it is hoped, that it will not be remembered, that interest is as much concerned to acquire, as to retain : it is modestly expected, that no mention will be made of the pride and fervour of party ; and that no note will be taken of the resentful jealousy of those temporal advantages, which, as

they form the leading theme of animadversion, may not unreasonably be presumed to be the principal ground of hostility.

In a spirit congenial to these feelings, Mr. B. seems not a little to have participated, when he thus openly states, as in another place* he indirectly insinuates, under the thin covering of the terms paganism and popery, that the religion of the Church of England is a mere engine of state; and as such “cried up by interested statesmen and their hireling priests;” who, he says again, naturally “support that religion which supports them:”† and that, at this moment “*pure Christianity*” (by which he describes the system taught by himself and Dr. Priestley,) “is so far from meeting with public encouragement in England, that it is in a state bordering upon persecution.”‡ This last remark indeed seems, according to Mr. B.’s view of things, to have been altogether unnecessary. The assertion, that “an established priesthood is in its very nature a persecuting order,” renders this a tautologous position. But, in what way do these professors of *pure Christianity* appear to be “in a state bordering upon persecution?” Simply, because they are not permitted to rail against established authority with impunity; to preach up doctrines in *politics*, subversive of subordination; to bring the government, both in church and state, into disrepute and contempt amongst the people, by every species of calumny; to establish the enlightened system of France, the Theophilanthropism of Lepaux, and the miso-monarchism of Paine. The government, the clergy, and the people of England, are surely much to blame, in throwing any obstacles in the way of such great reforms!

And what is the grand proof, adduced by Mr. B.

* P. 196. † P. 235. ‡ P. 197.

of the persecution carried on against *pure Christianity*, in England, at the present day? Plainly this, that the great champion of Unitarianism has been driven from his native country, and “compelled to seek for refuge” from the rage of persecuting bigotry, “in the transatlantic wilderness;—in which, however, it appears that he is subject to no deprivations; since we are informed in the very next line, that, in this *wilderness*, he has the good fortune to be surrounded by “enlightened sages.”* But, ludicrous as is this picture of the *wilderness of sages*, here presented by our author, it were unfeeling, and unpardonable, to trifle on such a subject. What Doctor Priestley’s reasons may have been for exchanging England for America, I shall not presume to pronounce. That they are not to be resolved “*solely*” into his *religious* opinions, as Mr. B. seems desirous to convey, is I believe, pretty generally understood. That the purity of Dr. P.’s private character, the amiable simplicity of his manners, the variety and strength of his talents, the persevering industry with which he pursued what he deemed useful truth, and the independent spirit, with which (had it not been phrenzied by the intemperance of party,) he might have so profitably maintained it,—are circumstances, which must make every good man regret that misapplication of his powers, which rendered it necessary for him to abandon his native country in the decline of life, I will most readily admit: and I freely subscribe to the strongest testimony, which his warmest admirers can bear, to the many and great virtues,† which

* Pp. 197, 198.

† From a friend, of the highest literary distinction and moral worth, who was connected by habits of early and continued intimacy with Dr. Priestley, I received, on the first publication of these remarks on that author’s character, a letter containing the following observations.

adorn his private life. But whilst I most cheerfully make these concessions to the talents and the virtues of Dr. Priestley; and whilst I join in the

“The character you give of Dr. Priestley, has reminded me of that drawn by Dr. Samuel Parr, in his letter from Irenopolis, to the inhabitants of Eleutheropolis. As this pamphlet was a temporary publication during the riots of Birmingham, and you have probably never seen it, I will transcribe the passage to which I refer.—‘I confess, with sorrow, that in too many instances, such modes of defence have been used against this formidable Heresiarch, as would hardly be justifiable in the support of Revelation itself, against the arrogance of a Bolingbroke, the buffoonery of a Maundeville, and the levity of a Voltaire. But the cause of orthodoxy requires not such aids. The Church of England approves them not. The spirit of Christianity warrants them not. Let Dr. Priestley be confuted where he is mistaken. Let him be exposed where he is superficial. Let him be rebuked where he is censorious. Let him be repressed where he is dogmatical. But let not his attainments be depreciated, because they are numerous almost without a parallel. Let not his talents be ridiculed, because they are superlatively great. Let not his morals be vilified, because they are correct without austerity, and exemplary without ostentation; because they present even to common observers the innocence of a hermit and the simplicity of a patriarch; and because a philosophic eye will at once discover in them, the deep fixed root of a virtuous principle, and the solid trunk of virtuous habit.’ This beautiful portrait is, I think, accurate in its lineaments. But there are two features in the character of Dr. Priestley, which it does not exhibit, and which to you I will not scruple to communicate. He has a sort of *moral apathy*, which makes him absolutely insensible of the severity of the wounds he inflicts in his polemic discussions. Feeling no enmities in his constitution, he makes no discrimination between friends and foes. And having adopted the language and dipped his pen in the gall of controversy, he suspects not that he excites bitterness of heart, because he is unconscious of it in himself. I could exemplify this observation, by his treatment of Dr. Enfield, Dr. Brocklesby, Judge Blackstone, and several others whom he really loved or respected. Another striking trait in his character, is an almost total deficiency in *discretion*, that intellectual faculty, which is, as Pope well expresses it, ‘although no science, fairly worth the seven.’—A report has prevailed here, that Dr. Priestley proposes to return to England. But I find

most decided reprobation of those savage acts of violence, which in his instance have disgraced the annals of English polity; yet I cannot hesitate to believe, that if, in any country, in which the direction of affairs was held by those enlightened politicians, and professors of *pure Christianity*, who form the associates of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, any man had employed himself for a series of years, in labouring to overturn the established order of things; and had even advanced so far, as, in the intoxication of his fancied success, openly to boast, that he had prepared a train, whereby the whole must inevitably be destroyed;* a very differ-

that his latest letters signify his intention of passing the remainder of his life in America, where he is happy in every respect, except the enjoyment of literary society, and possesses a library and philosophical apparatus far superior to those which he had at Birmingham."

This fragment, containing so much that is interesting, concerning Dr. Priestley, will, I conceive, not be unacceptable to the reader; and although I consider the bright parts of the character, to have been too highly emblazoned by Dr. Parr, the darker spots to have been too sparingly touched by my much valued correspondent, and some important points to have been entirely overlooked by both, yet I cannot withhold from the memory of a man certainly possessed of many amiable qualities, and some extraordinary endowments, a tribute, to which, two persons, eminent for their worth and their attainments, have conceived him to be justly entitled.

* "We are, as it were, laying gun-powder, grain by grain, under the old building of error and superstition, which a single spark may hereafter inflame, so as to produce an instantaneous explosion."—Importance of Free Enquiry, p. 40. What Dr. P. means by the *old building of error and superstition*, the context sufficiently explains. On the impossibility of supporting the ecclesiastical constitution, if once a great majority of the people can be made hostile to it; and on "the power of small changes in the political state of things, to overturn the best compacted establishments," he likewise enlarges with much earnestness, and force: *ibid.* pp. 39. 41. 44. The fittest seasons, and best opportunities, for *silently* working out the great effects, which he here professes to hold in view, this writer had before communi-

ent lot from that, which has fallen to Dr. Priestley, would await him. The privilege of transferring his residence to another land, unless indeed it were to that land from which no traveller returns, would hardly be conceded. Our enlightened philosophers, of the present day, adopt on these occasions much simpler modes of proceeding: and a peep across the British Channel, may readily satisfy us as to the nature of the process, where there is *no* "lucrative fable of Jesus Christ" to be maintained; *no* "established* clergy to breathe the fiery spirit of persecution;" and where the rights of civil and religious man, are explained and exercised upon the broadest principles of a philosophy, untrammelled, even to Mr. B.'s most sanguine wishes.

One distinction between the two cases may indeed possibly exist. The professors of an all-perfect philosophy and a Rational Christianity, *knowing* theirs to be the cause of virtue, and acting only from

cated to his fellow labourer Mr. Lindsey, in the dedication of his History of Corruptions, pp. vi. vii.—"While the attention of men in power, is engrossed by the difficulties that more immediately press upon them, the endeavours of the friends of reformation, in points of doctrine, pass with *less notice*, and operate *without obstruction*." Times of public danger and difficulty are thus pointed out, as best suited to lay that train, which was finally to explode with the ruin of the establishment. And indeed, at an earlier period of life, he had even ventured to promise himself a more rapid accomplishment of the great object of his wishes. Speaking of the establishment, and those abuses which he ascribes to the principles of the hierarchy, he does not scruple to predict, that in "some general convulsion of the state, some bold hand, secretly impelled by a vengeful providence, shall sweep down the whole together."—View of the Principles and Conduct of the Protestant Dissenters, p. 12.—Passages conveying similar sentiments in the writings of Dr. Priestley, might be accumulated: but their notoriety renders it unnecessary.

* It will be recollected that this was written in the year 1800.

a love of truth, are meritorious in removing, by *whatever* means, all impediments to the accomplishment of ends so glorious, as those *they* hold in view: whereas the advocates of received doctrines, and of existing establishments, not even believing what they profess, and being only concerned to defend a lucrative falsehood, are, by the original sin of their cause, criminal in the performance of every act, however natural and necessary, which has a tendency to maintain it. This distinction may, possibly supply a satisfactory explanation:—but to proceed.

As I cannot entirely agree with Mr. Belsham, respecting the persecution carried on by the established clergy, against those, who, under the title of Unitarians, are, as Mr. B. affirms, the only professors of a *pure* Christianity; so neither do I, respecting that, which he deems a natural consequence of this persecution, the great encrease of this body in numbers and consequence. Possibly indeed, without making any very valuable concession to Mr. B. it might be admitted, that “the number of *Rational* Christians,” (by which he means *Unitarians*, or the professors of his *Moral Christianity*,) “was never so great as at present :”^{*}—a position, which, at the same time, but badly accords with the assertion, that the early christian church was almost exclusively Unitarian. But, that “it is still a progressive cause,” can by no means be allowed. So that Mr. B. may safely release his mind from all apprehensions of that, which he so sincerely deprecates, “the *support* of civil authority ;” from which he seems to dread the only impediment to its triumphant progress.

If indeed, by “progressive cause,” be meant a

^{*} Review, p. 198.

progression in its course to that, which seems its natural termination, Deism, it might, undoubtedly, in that sense, be admitted to be progressive. But, if thereby be meant, a continued increase of numbers, nothing can be more opposite to the real state of the case. For let any candid and reflecting man, even of this very denomination, lay his hand upon his heart, and say what he thinks likely to be the case of the rising generation, educated in the Unitarian principles: let him say what *has* been the case of those educated in *the strictest principles of the sect*, under the immediate instruction of its greatest luminaries, Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, at the Academy of Hackney. Let Mr. B. himself say, what has been the progressive nature of the cause in that seminary. Mr. B. has too great a regard for truth, not to admit, that the pupils of the new light had gone beyond their teachers a little too far; that they had somewhat too strongly* ex-

* Mr. Belsham himself, in speaking of this subject, is obliged in a great measure to acknowledge the truth of this charge. "This fact," (he says, alluding to a statement similar to the above made by Mr. Carpenter,) "to a certain extent, cannot be denied; and most surely, it excited unpleasing sensations in many, and not least in the minds of those, whose endeavours to form them to usefulness in the Church were thus painfully disappointed."—However, immediately after, he seems, in the contrast between the systems pursued at Hackney and in other seminaries where education is conducted on a different principle, to change the tone of lamentation on this head into a note of triumph. "It is an easy thing," he remarks, "for tutors to educate their pupils in the trammels of any religious faith which they may choose. Take away the key of knowledge, and the business is done. You bring them out at once Calvinists, Arians, Papists, Protestants, any thing that you please; and ready to join in the cry against any sect, which, for the season, may be obnoxious to the ruling party. This was not the method pursued at Hackney: they gloried in encouraging freedom of inquiry: nor were they at all apprehensive, that the interests of truth and virtue would suffer by it in the end." (Letters on

emphified the progressive nature of the system, by reaching at once the goal of *Deism*, and that in some instances, perhaps not a few, the race had been

Arianism, p. 40.)—Thus, Mr. Belsham, on second thoughts, is of opinion, that what was done in Hackney, is a thing to be gloried in: and that in educating those who were designed for the christian ministry, so as to render them infidels and atheists, “the interests of truth and virtue cannot suffer in the end.”

But, that we may the better form a right judgment of that, which is conceived to constitute the excellence of those dissenting academies, to which such friends of rational inquiry as Mr. Belsham and Dr. Priestley have been used to look for the real improvement of youth, I here give an extract from Dr. Priestley’s *Memoirs* relative to this subject. In my time, the academy was in a state *peculiarly favourable to the serious pursuit of truth, as the students were about equally divided upon every question of much importance, such as liberty and necessity, the sleep of the soul, and all the articles of theological orthodoxy and heresy; in consequence of which, all these topics were the subjects of continual discussion.* Our tutors were of different opinions: Dr. Ashworth taking the orthodox side; Mr. Clarke, the sub-tutor, that of heresy, though always with the greatest modesty.”—Here is a view of the true way, in which, under the guidance of the new lights of philosophy and religion, youth is to be led on “*inter sylvas Academi quærere verum.*” The calm and undisturbed retirement of study exchanged for the unceasing wrangling of a debating club. Tutor and sub-tutor, master and pupil, all together by the ears, continually, on the gravest and deepest subjects of theological controversy. And the sublimest truths and most awful mysteries of revelation bandied about amongst boys, as the common and hourly topics of disputation: whilst the parties of combatants on every subject are equally matched, and falsehood and truth, infidelity and religion maintained by equal numbers. Under such circumstances of education, it has been truly remarked in reference to Dr. Priestley, that in the course, which by his own account he steered in his theological opinions, there is nothing to excite surprise. “A Calvinist at twelve; becoming an Arminian at eighteen; at twenty-one an Arian; at twenty-four a denier of his Saviour, and a disbeliever in the inspiration of the Scriptures.—Miserable infatuation! (it is justly added) to set the stripling on a sea, of which he knows neither the soundings nor the shore; and calmly to see him rush to every point of the compass, before he knows the bearings of any!”

crowned with the prize, of direct, avowed, and unqualified ATHEISM.

Mr. Belsham affirms, that "Mr. Wilberforce, and others who agree with him, seldom regard their system in a comprehensive view, or pursue their principles to their just and necessary consequences:"* and he adds, that "it is from the absurd and injurious consequences, which necessarily result from Mr. W.'s principles, that he infers their falsehood and impiety."† No words can more aptly convey my ideas of Mr. B.'s scheme, than those with which he has here supplied me: for, strange, as this gentleman and those who think with him, may affect to consider the charge, they by no means follow up their principles to their just and necessary consequences; nor, whilst they boast in a loud and exulting tone of their dauntless pursuit after truth, have they always the courage to be consistent throughout, and to advance boldly in the face of those conclusions, which to any intelligent and unprejudiced mind could not fail to evince "the

But this Academy, which was "in a state so peculiarly favourable to the serious pursuit of truth," was distinguished by other circumstances enumerated by Dr. Priestley, which were perhaps not less favourable to that end, than those which have been already named. "There was no provision for teaching the learned languages. We had even no compositions, or orations, in Latin. Our course of lectures was also defective, in containing no lectures on the Scriptures or on ecclesiastical history; and by the students in general (and Mr. Alexander and myself were no exceptions) commentators in general, and ecclesiastical history also, were *held in contempt*."—(Memoirs of Dr. Priestley, p. 21.)—Thus, all the prejudices of ancient learning, which might have acted as so many clogs upon the youthful genius, were completely removed; and nothing hindered the boy of the academy from fancying himself at once arrived at that goal, which, in the more measured walks of science, the matured student feels many laborious efforts still requisite to attain.

* P. 10.

† P. 11.

falsehood and impiety" of the system. But Mr. B. himself has well remarked, that "the natural and necessary consequences of principles are the same, whether the advocates of such principles are apprised of them or not, and whether they do or do not choose to contemplate and avow them :"* and fact completely proves, what reason would obviously suggest, that where the principles of this new sect have been fairly and honestly followed on to their legitimate consequences, the system of revelation, and in many cases of theism, has been entirely thrown up as a heap of mummery and priestcraft. To cite particular instances were invidious; but they are numerous, and could easily be adduced.

By what has been said, it is however far from my intention, to charge either Dr. Priestley or Mr. Belsham, with a disingenuous attempt, to escape from such consequences, as naturally flow from the opinions which they maintain. No, I believe them both to be incapable of duplicity. But, originally educated, as both confess to have been, in the strictest tenets of that creed, whose distinguishing doctrines they now reject; and having at an early age entertained a full conviction of the truth and importance of the Christian scheme; some latent influence of their first persuasion naturally remaining, they cannot now release themselves entirely from a Christian belief. Strangely as they have altered and disfigured the structure, the foundation still remains. The first impressions of the youthful mind are not easily effaced. And fortunately for these gentlemen, something of "what the nurse and priest have taught," still continues, in spite of their boast to the contrary, to retain a secret hold upon their thoughts. To have a fair experiment of the

* P. 11.

system, we must look to its effects upon those, who have never known Christianity, but in the Unitarian dress of Mr. Belsham and Dr. Priestley. Examine these, and behold its genuine fruits.

How then can we admit the truth of Mr. B.'s assertion, that the numbers of this sect daily* encrease? In one way indeed, but in that way only, can it bear any resemblance to fact. Men, who, having rejected the Christian revelation, are yet restrained, by a regard to opinion and decorum, from openly abdicating the Christian name, may find it not inconvenient to rank themselves of a class,

* The writer of a judicious paper in a late periodical publication, makes the following observations on the nature of the Unitarian or Socinian sect, and on the unlikelihood of its extension.—“Socinianism must ever from its nature be the most harmless of all heresies, the least contagious of all the varieties of human opinion. It has been called, and how aptly the history of its Hackney Academy and all its other institutions may prove, the half-way house to infidelity: but it should be remembered, that many who set out on the pilgrim's-progress of inquiry, take up their place of rest there, who, if there were no such inn upon the road, would infallibly proceed to Doubting Castle. It is a system which saves men from utter unbelief more frequently than it tempts them to it; and it never can become a popular doctrine. It appeals to the vanity of the half-learned, and the pride of the half-reasoning: but it neither interests the imagination, nor awakens the feelings, nor excites the passions, nor satisfies the wants of the human heart. Hence it must ever be confined to a few scanty congregations composed wholly of the reading class, and is equally incapable of producing either extensive good or extensive evil.” *Quarterly Review*, vol. iv. p. 485. With this writer I entirely agree in the opinion, that this jejune and cheerless heresy is not likely to be embraced by many: but that so far as its influence does extend, it will be found productive of great evil without any countervailing good, is, I think, as evident, as that such an effect must follow from a dereliction of all the leading tenets of a Christian's belief: nor I confess, does it appear to me a matter of much consequence, whether the traveller, of whom the Reviewer speaks, proceeds on his entire journey, or stops short at the inn which Unitarianism provides for him on the way.

whose latitude of opinion can occasion but little embarrassment to that freedom for which they contend: and thus Mr. B. may possibly reckon among the residents of his "mansion," many who are content to sojourn there, on account of its commodious neighbourhood to that region, which they regard as their true and proper home.

One proof, however, Mr. B. produces of his assertion, which might not have occurred to many, and which is entitled to a more than ordinary degree of attention: namely, that "there are thousands" of those professing themselves of the established church, who think with him, "but are deterred by secular considerations, and the harsh spirit of the times, from avowing their real principles."* Indeed according to the charitable notions entertained by Mr. B. in common with Dr. Priestley,† of the cha-

* P. 227.

† Mr. Belsham's liberal views of the character of the clergy of the established church, have been already noticed, in this appendix pp. 159, 160. Dr. Priestley's representations are of a nature equally complimentary. In his *Hist. of Cor.* vol. i. p. 147. he says of the Trinitarians of the present age, that "they are all reducible to two classes, viz. that of those who, if they were ingenuous, would rank with Socinians, believing that there is no proper divinity in Christ besides that of the father; or else with Tritheists, holding three equal and distinct Gods." Having thus distributed the whole body of professed Trinitarians between *Insincerity* and *Ignorance*, he afterwards in the conclusion of the same work, (vol. ii. p. 471.) narrows his attention to the clerical part of that body, pronouncing their arguments in defence of the system they support, to be "so palpably weak, that it is *barely possible* they should be in earnest:" by which it is not difficult to discover, to which of the two classes before named, the established clergy were in his opinion to be consigned.—That Dr. Priestley should, indeed, have imagined, that many, who rejected the doctrines of the Established Church might yet be found among the ranks of its professed teachers, may well be supposed, when we recollect, that he deliberately advised Mr. Lindsey to retain his preferments in the Church,

racter of those who maintain the national faith, it is not surprising, that this should appear, to minds so prepared, with all the circumstances of probability. And certainly no argument can be more convenient: from no combination of events can its force suffer any diminution, and from no ingenuity of reply can it ever meet refutation. Though the entire host of those professing the *pure* Christianity of the Unitarian, were ostensibly reduced to Dr. P. and himself, yet by the application of this argument, aided by a portion of that faith, which not having been largely expended on other subjects, Mr. B. might have to bestow in abundance on this and similar occasions, I should not be surprised to find him solacing himself even then with the satisfactory persuasion, that the "glorious period" was fast approaching, in which "the Unitarian church" was about to "comprehend in its ample enclosure, the whole Christianized world:"* the prejudices and interests of mankind, causing but a temporary and artificial suppression of those sentiments, which must necessarily and universally prevail. This argument then I must admit to be wholly unanswerable.

Dr. Priestley has indeed advanced, that he "never knew a single instance of any person, who was once well grounded in Unitarian principles, becoming an unbeliever."† If the becoming an unbeliever, be admitted as the proper proof of an antecedent deficiency of confirmation in Unitarian principles, the position is a safe one. But if Dr. P. means to

at the same time that he laboured to undermine its creed: an advice, however, which the Rector of Catterick was too honest to comply with, although it might not be unpalatable to certain clergymen of the present day; such as Mr. Fellowes and Mr. Stone.

* Review, p. 266.

† Theol. Repos. vol. iv. p. 24.

say, that the influence of Unitarian principles is unfavourable to infidelity, it need only to be replied, that the fact speaks a language directly the reverse. For it is notorious, and it will require no small degree of hardihood to deny it, that from those who have *professed* Unitarianism in England, the largest stock of unbelievers has arisen : nay more, that their principal Academy, the place in which Unitarian principles were inculcated in their greatest purity and with every advantage of zealous ability in the teacher, and of unbiassed docility in the learner, has borne witness to the efficacy of those principles, by its dissolution, imperiously demanded by the prevalence of Infidel opinions. Now in what way shall we account for this event? Was Unitarianism not properly taught at Hackney? Or, with all its vaunted simplicity, is it a scheme so difficult to conceive, that the learners not being able to comprehend it rightly,* became unbelievers from not having been *firmly grounded*? Howsoever it be explained, the fact is incontrovertible, and seems not a little to countenance the idea, that the road to Unitarianism differs from that which leads to Infidelity by so slight a distinction, that the traveller not unfrequently mistakes his way. And surely, if, with Mr. Wilberforce, we suppose the station of the former to be placed at no great distance from the confines of the latter, it is not surprising, that they who in the morning of life begin their journey from this advanced stage, should be able to finish the entire course with ease; whilst those who do not reach it

* Indeed Mr. B. seems to represent Unitarianism, as a matter complicated and difficult to be understood. For the total rejection of Christianity by some of his Unitarian brethren, he assigns the following reasons. "They either did not *understand their principles*; or they were *perplexed with difficulties*, which *perhaps* patience and attention might have solved; or" &c. Review, p. 265.

till the evening of their days, may have some indisposition to proceed, especially if from early habits, they had been taught to feel a salutary horror, of those regions that lie beyond.

One difficulty, amounting to paradox, which attaches to this entire system, yet remains to be noticed. It might appear to such as have been used to consider Christianity, as something more than natural religion with a superadded proof of a future state of retribution, that they who hold this to be the sum of the Christian scheme, must at the same time reject the writings of the New Testament, or at least all those parts that go beyond the mere facts, of the life and resurrection of Christ. Mr. B. however informs us, in what manner the Unitarians, whilst they retain the title of Christians by acknowledging the authority of the New Testament, yet contrive to preserve their "simple creed," unaffected by those important truths which it contains. There are two ways, in which the word of revelation, and a system of religious belief may be made to square. One is, by conforming our belief to revelation; the other, by adjusting the revelation to our belief. The latter is that chosen by Mr. B. and his Unitarian associates; and accordingly, the New Testament, and the creed of the Unitarian, are at the same time, without difficulty retained.

Of the mode of adjustment Mr. B. exhibits a perfect specimen. "Christ," he says, "being described in the New Testament as a man, having appeared as a man, having called himself a man,—having had all the accidents of a man; having been born, having lived, eaten, drank, slept, conversed, rejoiced, wept, suffered, and died as other men," there is sufficient reason to pronounce him really such; no farther proof can be required: and the onus probandi, he contends, lies with them, who "maintain that he

was something more than man:" and whatever texts of scripture can be adduced in support of that opinion, he adds, "the Unitarians pledge themselves to shew, that they are *all* either *interpolated*, *corrupted*, or, *misunderstood*:"* in short, they engage to get clearly rid of them in some way or other. Either the passage should have no place in scripture: or, if it must be admitted, it should appear under some different modification: or, if the present reading must be allowed, it is wrongly interpreted by all but Unitarians; and sometimes even the subject originally misunderstood by the inspired writer himself: until, at length, the sacred volume is completely discharged of all that exceeds the convenient portable creed of the Unitarian. This, it will be allowed, is, in Mr. B's own words, "*making Scripture with a witness*:"† and exhibits no mean specimen of my Lord Peter's ingenious device, in extracting the legitimate meaning of his father's will: the "*totidem syllabis*," or at all events, the "*totidem literis*," cannot fail to supply the deficiencies of the "*totidem verbis*."‡

Lest however these ingenious modes of eliciting the sense of scripture, should be deemed too bold, Mr. B. supplies a decisive reason to prove, that the Unitarian alone is duly qualified, to form a sound judgment in matters of sacred criticism. To comprehend the true import of scripture, he informs us, "requires time, labour, patience, and candour."§ How then could it be expected, that any but the aforesaid moral teachers of Christianity, should rightly ascertain its meaning? That this laborious, patient, and candid expurgation of scripture, whereby every passage intimating the divine nature of

* Review, pp. 270, 271, 272.

† Tale of a Tub, sect. ii.

‡ Review, p. 116.

§ Review, p. 272.

Christ is completely expunged, or new modelled so as to speak a different language, shall be stigmatised by the harsh representation, of "mangling and altering the translation to the mind" of the Unitarian, as Mr. Fuller and Mr. Wilberforce have, it seems, very uncivilly described it, only serves to recall to Mr. Belsham's "recollection the honest Quaker's exclamation, O argument! O argument! the Lord rebuke thee:"* the *argument* being without

* This animated and delicate species of irony is, with Mr. Belsham, a favourite mode of treating his literary antagonists. Having, in his controversy with Mr. Carpenter, established the inconsistency of man's freedom with the divine foreknowledge, on such principles, that, as he modestly affirms, "*no proposition in Euclid admits of a more perfect demonstration:*" he suddenly recollects himself,—“But all this is metaphysical reasoning; and why should we puzzle ourselves with metaphysical subtilities?” And then in a spirit of humanity, sympathizing most tenderly with his galled and lacerated opponent, he exclaims—“*O naughty metaphysics!* thus cruelly to impale a *worthy well-meaning gentleman*, upon the horns of a goring dilemma, and to leave him writhing and smarting there without relief.—I am sorry for my friend's unfortunate situation.” (Lett. on Arian. p. 47.) and so he goes on grieving for the cruel discomfiture which he had himself caused to *his friend*; but which, it seems, he could not well have avoided, from the uncommon keenness of his argumentative talent, and the piercing potency of his Metaphysics. It should however be observed, to the credit of Mr. Belsham, that he has not been influenced by any unworthy fear, to withhold from the world, the knowledge of the nature and use of those all-subduing weapons, which have never failed to secure to him such easy triumphs in his controversial campaigns. The Logic and Metaphysic, whereby he has laid many a sturdy combatant low, he has fairly given to the public; and it is now the fault of those, with whom he has henceforward to contend, if they do not conceive with the same clearness, and reason with the same precision, as himself.

On the work which exhibits these, and which, dignified with the title of *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind and of Moral Philosophy*, professes to give, within the compass of one octavo volume, a most complete view of Logics, Morals, and Metaphysics, I have had occasion already to offer some remarks, in

question, all on the side of the Unitarian, whose modifications of the Gospel, exhibiting it as a mere revival and confirmation of natural religion, cannot

the preceding notes of this appendix. Those remarks, however, as they relate for the most part, to detached topics, rather incidental to the main object of the work than essentially connected with it, scarcely supply an adequate idea of its true value, and of the benefits which must have accrued, in point of strict reasoning and just conceptions, to the students of Hackney, and which are now held out by this publication to the world at large. I shall here adduce a few specimens, which go more immediately to its general excellence as a treatise of Logical and Metaphysical instruction. First, in the list of *axioms* we find the following, which may prove the degree of caution with which our author proceeds.—“Axiom 4. The *agreement* of two ideas with a third, *cannot prove* their *disagreement* with each other.” (p. lii.)—By this, such reasoners as are naturally led to conclude, that when two ideas agree with a third, they *must disagree* with each other, are completely guarded against falling into this vulgar error. Again, in the next page, we are apprised of a *term*, so circumstanced, as that it may become a *proposition*; namely, the major term in a Syllogism, whose major premiss is a particular affirmative. For of such a term he says, “If it be the subject, it is particularly taken *as being a particular proposition* ;” and again, “If it be the predicate, it is particularly taken *as being an affirmative proposition*.” This will provide against the errors of those, who might have conceived, that the term would still remain a *term*, and could never have turned into a *proposition* of any sort. Again, in the matter of *Definition*, we find much more of copiousness and versatility than can be met with in ordinary treatises of Logics and Metaphysics. The definitions with which the work commences, are those of *Perception*, and *Sensation*. These and their concomitants we find thus variously propounded.

1. “*Perception* is the attention, which the mind pays to a variety of impressions made upon it by external objects or by internal feelings.”
2. “*Perception* is the faculty, by which we acquire sensations and ideas.”
3. “*Sensation* is the perception of an object by the organs of sense.”
4. “*Sensation* is the faculty of acquiring certain internal feelings, by the impression of external objects upon the organs of sense.”

fail to approve themselves to all “men of enlightened minds;” whilst the old orthodox fancies—that “the corruption of human nature, the atonement of

5. “*A Sensation* is the impression made upon the mind by an object actually present.”

6. “*Sensations* are internal feelings, excited by the impressions of external objects upon the organs of sense.” See pp. vii. 10, 11. 15, 16.

Now, not only have we here a rich variety of definitions, but such as, by a due combination of their powers, is found capable of engendering more.—Thus, if we combine the second and fifth, we obtain a new definition for *Perception*; namely “the faculty by which we acquire *impressions* made upon the mind,” &c.: so that *Perception* finally turns out to be its own producer, inasmuch as it seeks after and acquires those impressions, from which, we are told in the first definition, it derives its existence.—Again, if we combine the first and sixth, we obtain a more extensive and detailed view of the nature of *Perception*: for since in the latter, *Sensations* are described as a species of “*internal feelings*,” it follows, that “*Perception* is the attention which the mind pays to a variety of impressions made upon it, 1. by external objects, 2. by *Sensations*, 3. by all other internal feelings.” And, lastly, since by the fifth definition, “a *Sensation* is an impression made upon the mind,” if we join this in friendly union with the two former, we have then contained in the definition of *Perception*, “an attention to impressions made upon the mind, by impressions which *are* made upon the mind.” I will follow this no farther. I do not pretend to exhaust the combinations and their results: these few perhaps may satisfy the reader.

Of our author’s uncommon powers in *definition*, I shall only give one instance more: but that one cannot but be deemed sufficient, inasmuch as it will shew the possibility of deciding, in an instant, the most difficult questions in Metaphysics. “*VOLITION* is that state of mind, which is immediately *previous* to actions which are called voluntary.”—“*NATURAL LIBERTY*, or, as it is more properly called *PHILOSOPHICAL LIBERTY*, is the power of doing an action, or its contrary, *all the previous circumstances remaining the same*.” (p. 227.)—Now here is the point of free will at once decided: for, *volition* itself being included among the *previous circumstances*, it is a manifest contradiction in terms, to suppose “the power of doing an action or its contrary, all the previous circumstances remaining the same;” since that supposes the power of acting *voluntarily against a vo-*

the Saviour, and the sanctifying influence of the holy spirit," are the prominent doctrines of the Christian revelation,—are left to the professors of the national faith; interested and unprincipled men,

lition. After this, surely Mr. Belsham might have spared himself the trouble of the ninety two pages which follow, as his opponents must have been at once suffocated by the above definitions. But the philosopher was determined to give the absurd advocate for free will no quarter; and therefore has dealt out argument after argument, blow after blow, until the adversary is no longer able to stand before him. He was not even content, until he brought the evidence of *Mathematics* to his aid, to prove *ex absurdo*, that philosophical liberty totally confounds the distinction between virtue and vice. Thus, "for example, *benevolence without liberty* is no virtue; *malignity without liberty* is no vice. Both are equally in a neutral state. *Add a portion of liberty to both*; benevolence instantly becomes an eminent virtue, and malignity an odious vice. That is, IF TO EQUALS YOU ADD EQUALS, THE WHOLE WILL BE UNEQUAL; than which nothing can be more absurd!!!"—Does the reader doubt that these words are fairly quoted? Let him turn to pp. 258, 259. of the treatise, and satisfy himself that there is in the world such a mathematician as the author of the above proof. But I have done with this work. It must by this time be clear, that in *Logics, Metaphysics, Morals, and Mathematics*, the students must have been well instructed at Hackney.

Having been led by the subject of this note to the mention of a combination of metaphysical and mathematical reasoning almost too ludicrous for serious observation, I cannot make better amends to the reader for such a demand upon his patience, than by directing his attention to a very small but valuable tract, entitled, *The Doctrine of Philosophical necessity* briefly invalidated; in which the author, Mr. Dawson of Sedbergh, has most happily effected that which has been here so unmeaningly caricatured: having enlisted the accuracy and brevity of *Mathematics* (a science with which he is so well acquainted) in the cause of *Metaphysics*: and having thereby been enabled to plant the standard of *Philosophical Liberty* on a strength, from which the advocates of the opposite doctrine have not found it convenient to attempt to dislodge him. One faint effort indeed was made by a writer in the *Monthly Review* for July 1781. But this was so easily repelled by the author in a second edition of his Tract, that as far as I can learn, the attempt has not been repeated.

who, not believing the doctrines they uphold, "testify their regard to the scriptures by empty professions;" or ignorant and blundering bigots, who are led by a slavish and "blind submission to vulgar interpretations."* It needs scarcely to be remarked, that among the virtues of the new system, *modesty* seems not to occupy, any more than *charity*, a very distinguished place.

For the fulfilment of the engagement, to overturn every interpretation of scripture, that wars with the simple creed of the Unitarian, Mr. B. refers us,—for he has not thought proper to undertake the task himself,—to a list of commentators, on whose critical exertions he is willing to rest his cause. Here we find, in addition to some respectable names, and to some from whom his peculiar opinions will not receive much support, the names of "Wakefield,

* For these two descriptions of characters, and for that of the Unitarians, placed in direct opposition to both, as the only "enlightened and consistent Christians," the reader may turn to what Mr. B. has said. Review, pp. 26—30. 196. 199. 220. 230. 233. Indeed it should be stated in justice to Mr. B. that the charges of incompetency, insincerity, and slavish adherence to popular systems, are not confined by him to the divines of the established church. Some not a little distinguished amongst the Dissenters, are examples of the impartiality of his strictures. Even the pious, candid, and learned Doddridge had adopted an "erroneous and unscriptural system." "His love of popularity," with other causes, had "strangely warped his judgment in the interpretation of the scriptures; and his works are, consequently, "not calculated to instruct his readers in the true sense of the Christian Scriptures, nor to infuse into them a spirit of *rational and manly piety*." (pp. 102, 103. 213. 214.) He had unfortunately retained some of those old fashioned notions about *atonement* and *grace*, which have been vulgarly supposed to distinguish Christianity from natural religion. He was not in short a *Rational Dissenter*: for it is not from the members of the establishment solely, but from the various other classes of dissenters, that the grand characteristic of *Rationality* divides the Unitarian.

Evenson, Lindsey, and Priestley.”* These last being the only persons now living,† of those whom he has enumerated as the great oracles of Gospel interpretation, to these of course he must principally refer, when he affirms, as we have seen, that “the Unitarians pledge themselves;” to get rid of every passage in scripture, that militates against the principles of their system. Now, I do agree with Mr. B. that if he had traversed the entire range of all who profess to have a single shred of Christianity hanging to them, he could not have found a phalanx more admirably fitted, by the apparatus of “interpolations, omissions, false readings, mistranslations, and erroneous interpretations,”‡ to empty scripture of every idea, that does not correspond with the *pure* Christianity of those who call themselves Unitarians.

* Review, p. 206.

† It is matter of melancholy reflection that of the above-named writers, all actively engaged in the propagation of their respective opinions when the first edition of this work was published, not one is at this day living. So rapidly do we all pass off in this fleeting scene of things!—Respecting those who no longer live to answer for themselves, I confess I feel somewhat of the force of the maxim, *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*. And yet, when it is considered, that though the man dies, the author lives; that the interests of the living should not be sacrificed to a sentiment unprofitable to the dead; that, on the contrary, were the deceased himself to rise from the grave, he would probably feel it his first duty to oppose those very errors which he had before been industrious to disseminate:—there seems no good reason, why any greater delicacy should now be used in treating of the pernicious mistakes and misconceptions of such writers, than had formerly been observed; more particularly as the subject is infinitely too important for compromise. “*Nec nocet veritas mortuis, et multum prodest vivis,*” is undoubtedly a maxim deserving some consideration. I have then, on the entire view of the case, neither retracted nor softened any observation applying to the works of the above named authors, unless where I have had cause to doubt the truth and justice of the observation itself.

‡ Review, p. 206.

Paine could not well have been added to the list. *He* most *imprudently* strikes down all at once, and would brush away the flimsy cobwebs, of both Old and New Testament, at one stroke. But certainly, more resolute* expungers, parers, and diversifiers of sacred writ, he could not have discovered in the whole tribe of poleemics. Of their powers in this way some few specimens have been exhibited, in

* Dr. Geddes has travelled too slowly through the Old Testament, to entitle him by his meritorious services in the New, to a place in the *present* list. But from the *liberal* views which the part of his translation already published, joined to his late volume of Critical Remarks, presents, concerning the *false representations of the Deity in the Pentateuch*.—the *cruel and sanguinary character of the God of the Hebrews*.—the *juggle of the miracles said to be wrought by Moses*.—the *incredible number of prodigies not literally to be believed*.—the *frequent interposition of the Deity and his agents, not to be admitted*.—the *absurdity of attributing inspiration to the writers of the early books of the Old Testament*.—the *error, inconsistency, and downright absurdity, to be found in the Hebrew writings, from which their inspiration cannot be credited, even on the authority of St. Paul, or though an angel from heaven were to teach it*.—the *information of the Hebrew historians derived from public registers, popular traditions, and old songs*.—from these, and other observations of a similar nature, there is offered a reasonable promise, that when this translator of the BOOKS ACCOUNTED SACRED, shall have extended his researches to the New Testament, and thereby clearly made known *his scheme of Christianity*, he will prove himself fully entitled, to have his name enrolled among the most enlightened of Mr. B.'s Unitarian commentators. When we find him thus freely concurring with Lord Bolingbroke, in pronouncing the God of *Moses* to be "partial, unjust, and cruel, delighting in blood, commanding assassinations, massacres, and even exterminations of people:" can we doubt, that he will agree with his Lordship, and other *philosophic* enquirers, in viewing the God of *Paul* in a light equally unworthy of our religious adoration?—Bolingbroke's Works, vol. v. p. 567, —4to. 1754.

The earthly career of Dr. Geddes has been closed, since the above was written: nor did he live long enough to carry his mischievous perversions of Scripture beyond the limit of the Pentateuch and the Historical books.

the foregoing *Dissertations*; and, from the notable exertions of master-criticism, which have been there occasionally noticed, little doubt can be entertained, of the sufficiency of these writers, to fulfil the engagement, entered into on their behalf by Mr. Belsham.

Our author himself, indeed, has favoured us with but few displays of his critical ingenuity. Those few, however, prove him by no means unworthy of the cause which he supports. The two passages, which expressly ascribe the office of *intercession* to Christ, are, (Rom. viii. 34.) *He is now at the right hand of God, making intercession for us*: and (Hebr. vii. 25.) *He ever liveth to make intercession for us*. Now as Mr. B. cannot allow to Christ the office of intercessor, he begins with remarking, that “the exact import of the phrase is difficult to be ascertained” in these passages: and for this he assigns a reason, which cannot be denied to be sufficient, that probably *the writers themselves annexed to it no very distinct idea*.* St. Paul it is clear, was no *Rational* Christian; or he would not have used words so inaccurately and unphilosophically; for, besides the aforesaid vagueness of expression, it is certain, that “*God has no right hand at which Jesus can stand, to intercede*.”† By this philosophical discovery, the authority of St. Paul is completely and at once set aside. His words, it is shewn, admit no precise meaning. That however, which St. Paul *ought* to have said, Mr. B. informs us: viz. “that Jesus having been advanced to great dignity and felicity, is, by the appointment of God, continually employing his renovated and improved powers, in some unknown way, for the benefit of his church.” We are told, that “we may *imagine* what we please, but that more than this is not revealed;”

* Review, pp. 69, 70.

† Review, p. 70.

of which it unfortunately happens, that not one word is revealed—except by Mr. Belsham: St. Paul having simply said, that *Christ is now at the right hand of God, making intercession for us.*—God however has *no right hand*; and *interceding* does not mean, *interceding*.*

* Mr. Belsham's remark on the force of the original word, rendered by us, *making intercession*, deserves to be noticed. "The word," he says, "expresses any interference of one person *for* or *against* another." Now, from this it follows, that if Christ be not supposed to interfere *for us*, he must be employed in exercising his powers *against us*. Does Mr. B. prefer this to the received sense? It appears, however, that he has borrowed his view of this passage from Dr. Taylor's note on Rom. viii. 27. as he refers us to that for full satisfaction. Such then is the joint light of Dr. Taylor and Mr. Belsham. But it seems necessary to remind Mr. B. of the difference between *ἐντυγχάνειν κατὰ*, and *ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ*. I must therefore take the liberty of referring him to his Lexicon. Or, if he *will* look to Commentators, perhaps were he to consult Locke and Pierce,—two of those very commentators whom he himself has named, but seems to have *named only* as giving a grace and character to his list, whilst they certainly deserved to have been placed in better company,—he would find their interpretation decidedly in favour of that, which no scholar can question to be the sense of the original, *interceding*. As the authority of a *German* commentator is likely also to have considerable weight with Mr. B. I would recommend it to him to attend to Rosenmüller's distinction, (Rom. xi. 2.)—"ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ τινος, est *negotium alicujus commendare, intercedere pro aliquo*; ἐντυγχάνειν κατὰ τινος, est *aliquem accusare*:" so says Schleusner likewise, (who deserves to be particularly consulted on the word *ἐντυγχάνω*) and so say all the Lexicons. Mr. B. however says otherwise. "Time, labour, patience, and candour" have, no doubt, convinced him that they are wrong.

As Mr. B. has referred to Dr. Taylor, for the true and adequate sense of the original word in these passages, it is but fair to state that writer's observations on the force of the term as applied in Rom. viii. 27. "The spirit of God *makes intercession for the Saints*, not by making application to God on their behalf, but by directing and qualifying *their* supplications in a proper manner, by his agency and influences upon their hearts; which, according to the Gospel scheme, is the peculiar work and

With a few other criticisms of the like nature Mr. Belsham has enriched his work. He has, however, not adventured far into the field of controversy.

office of the HOLY SPIRIT.—What then? Is Dr. Taylor, *he* who has so “well explained the Jewish phrases in his *admirable key*,”—is *he* after all, but one of those “popular interpreters,” who, in opposition to the “Rational Christian,” contend for the idle notion of the *existence* and *influence* of the *Holy Spirit*? And does *he*, to whom Mr. B. refers, for a full explanation of the original phrase commonly rendered in the sense of *making intercession for us*, expound the words $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\upsilon\chi\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota\ \upsilon\pi\epsilon\gamma$, when applied to the Holy Spirit, as signifying that benevolent interference, whereby our supplications are rendered more acceptable and effectual with our Almighty Father? The same words, it is clear, cannot be instantly purged of this meaning, when they are applied by the same writer, in a few lines after, to the case of our blessed Lord: so that I fear much, that when Mr. B. comes to reconsider this matter, he will be obliged to repudiate his boasted auxiliary, Dr. Taylor, as *little better* than *Orthodox*.

What had been thus given, in the former editions of this work, as matter of speculation, has now become matter of fact: Mr. Belsham, in his latter views of this subject, has carefully omitted the mention of Dr. Taylor. He finds it much safer to place his reliance on Mr. Lindsey; an authority, which is not likely to fail him in any Unitarian perversion of the sense of scripture. And, with his assistance, having first explained the word $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\upsilon\chi\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota$, as expressing any kind of interference whatever, he arrives at this conclusion, that what is called the *intercession* of Christ implies the “operation and effect of his mission and doctrine in the world.” (Calm Inquiry, &c. p. 327.) In like manner, the Unitarian Version, to which he refers, and in which probably he but quotes himself. For an admirable exposure of the absurdity of the interpretation thus given by Mr. Belsham and his Unitarian Version, I refer the reader to Mr. Nares’s Remarks, p. 140—144. I shall only add, for the purpose of shewing how miserably unfit the Editors of this Version are for the work which they have undertaken, that in their note on this word in Rom. viii. 34, whilst they profess to give the interpretation of it by Schleusner, (an authority to which I had formerly taken the liberty of referring Mr. Belsham,) they garble and actually falsify his application of the term: and again, that in their note on the same word in Hebr. vii. 26, they repeat the identical error of reference into which Schleusner had fallen, quoting Acts xxvii. 24, instead of Acts xxv. 24: and this too,

He has trusted rather to abstract reasoning, upon what he calls philosophical principles; and whilst he has confined himself to the stringing together of a number of rapid conclusions from plausible premises, or to what is vulgarly stiled declamation,* he has left it to the more critical advocates

whilst they are engaged in enumerating the precise parts of the New Testament in which the word is to be found, and would have us believe that they have consulted those very passages for its meaning: thus evincing, at the same time, their servile adherence to any authority on which they may choose to rely, and their negligent rashness united with affected research in matters relating to the accuracy of the sacred text.

* One of the finest possible specimens of the species of *criticism* that goes by this name, is to be found in another publication of Mr. Belsham's, which I have already noticed, entitled *Letters on Arianism*. At p. 129, of that work, he attacks the absurdity, of deducing from the language used throughout the New Testament respecting the *creation of all things by Jesus Christ*, the strange conclusion, that by him a creation was literally effected. He admits, indeed, that in Ephesians iii. 9. it is said, that "God created all things by Jesus Christ:"—that in Heb. i. 2. it is said, "by whom also he made the worlds:"—and again in Colossians i. 15, 16. "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature, for by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." But after launching against these, the usual Socinian refutations,—that *creating* does not mean *creating*, and that *worlds* are *dispensations*, &c. &c.—he proceeds, by a still happier flight, to shew that the same language is as applicable to Buonaparté as to Jesus Christ. I give his words.—"Of a certain person, who now makes a very considerable figure in the world, it may be said with truth, so far as the civil state of the continent of Europe is concerned, that he is the creator of all these new distinctions, high and low, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all these things are made by him, and for him, and he is before them all, takes precedence both in time and dignity, and by him do all these things consist. Yet who would infer from such language as this, that the present ruler of France is a being of superior order to mankind,

of Unitarianism to *prove*, that the words of scripture bear that meaning which he every where *assumes*. Indeed, this work, the professed object of which is to try the doctrines of the gospel by the standard of scripture no less than by that of reason, is so miserably deficient in the point of critical enquiry, that its avowed admirers, the Analytical Reviewers, feel it necessary to admit, whilst they endeavour to vindicate, this defect.—“We have said, this is a popular work. The reader must not look into it for verbal criticism, or the citation of ancient authority.” But they add in excuse, “the work to which it is a reply, was altogether declamation.”* And if so, it has undoubtedly been answered in its own way.

I have now done with Mr. Belsham; nor should I have directed the attention of the reader so much to this gentleman’s performance, had I known any†

much less that he is the maker of the world? *The language which is true of Buonaparte, in a civil sense, is applicable to Jesus Christ in a moral view; but it no more implies pre-existence, or proper creative power, in one case, than in the other.”!!!—This comment of Mr. Belsham’s requires no comment from me.*

* Review for March, 1798.

† That part of the Unitarian creed, which relates to the person and character of our Lord, has received some additional touches from the hand of Mr. Belsham, in a work recently published; which he entitles, *A Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ*; and in which he professes to give a formal digest of the recognised opinions of the Unitarians upon this subject in the year 1811. Of this digest I select the few passages which follow.—“The Unitarian doctrine is, that Jesus of Nazareth was a man constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices, and frailties,”—“that he was born in low circumstances, having no peculiar advantages of education, or learning, &c.”—“The Unitarians maintain, that Jesus and his Apostles were supernaturally instructed as far as was necessary for the execution of their commission, that is, for the revelation and proof of the doctrine of eternal life, and that the

other work, than the Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Treatise, in which the entire system and bearings of the doctrines called *Unitarian* are exhibited with

favour of God extended to the Gentiles equally with the Jews; and that Jesus, and his Apostles, and others of the primitive believers, were occasionally inspired to foretell future events. But they believe that supernatural inspiration was limited to these cases alone: and that when Jesus or his Apostles deliver opinions upon subjects unconnected with the object of their mission, such opinions, and their reasonings upon them, are to be received with the same attention and caution with those of other persons in similar circumstances, of similar education, and with similar habits of thinking." (pp. 447. 451.) Here then is an improved view of the case: a manifest progress in the Unitarian system. The supernatural instruction vouchsafed to our Lord was strictly limited to the object of his mission: this object was, exclusively, to make known the doctrine of eternal life, and the admission of the Gentiles to divine favour equally with the Jews: in all matters not connected with this object, the opinions and reasonings of our Lord are to be esteemed of no greater value than those of any person of similar circumstances and education, he being subject to the same ignorance and prejudices to which the common nature of man is subject: and as he was of low circumstances and had no peculiar advantages of education or learning, of course it follows upon the whole, that the opinions and reasonings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, are (except when they relate to the doctrine of a future life and universal retribution) to be treated with as little respect, as those of any person of low origin and circumstances who had received as few advantages of learning or education. I have not carried on the argument as regarding the Apostles, for Mr. Belsham and his associates have long ago disposed of the Epistles. But how much of the Gospels must now follow them as waste paper?—Yet farther, it is not merely the *ignorance and prejudices*, to which our Lord was *as subject as other men*, that we have to guard against in his opinions and reasonings on all topics, save the one above excepted; but we have also to secure ourselves against the consequences of those *infirmities and frailties* of all descriptions which are incident to human nature, and to which our Lord was not less liable than other human beings. Thus, according to Mr. Belsham, the moral as well as the intellectual imperfections, which render the opinions and reasonings of men, and more particularly of men who have had no peculiar advantages of education or learn-

equal brevity, distinctness, and candour. To Mr. B. is certainly due, the praise of an honest and open avowal of his sentiments. And, in his work, as I

ing, liable to error and exception, alike affect the opinions and reasonings of our blessed Lord : save only on that one subject, to which, Mr. Belsham informs us, his commission was rigidly restricted. As Mr. Belsham's language seems here to cast a reflection on the moral character of our Lord, it is but justice to Mr. B. to state what he has expressly said upon that point. "The moral character of Christ, through the whole course of his *public ministry*, as recorded by the Evangelists, is pure and unimpeachable in every particular. Whether this perfection of character in *public life*, combined with the general declaration of his freedom from sin, establish, or were intended to establish, the fact, that Jesus through the whole course of his *private life* was completely exempt from all the errors and failings of human nature, is a question of no great intrinsic moment, and concerning which we have no sufficient data to lead to a satisfactory conclusion." (p. 190.) Here Mr. Belsham admits, that we have no actual proof of any sinful acts committed by our Lord in his private life, so that we cannot positively and satisfactorily pronounce any thing upon that head. But it must be observed, that this admission has been made after the recital of certain declarations of scripture, that "he knew no sin ;" that he "was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners ;" that he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth ;" and others of the same import :—although, as these declarations do not relate to the object of Christ's mission as stated by Mr. Belsham, it is difficult to discover to what credit they are entitled upon the principle which he has laid down. In a distant part of his work, however, in which he was sufficiently removed from the influence of the above testimonies, and when he prepares himself to sum up resolutely the articles of the Unitarian creed, he rises above the weakness into which he had here allowed himself to fall ; and (as we have seen in the two preceding pages) affirms of that great Being, who came to redeem the world from sin, that he was subject to the common infirmities and frailties of human nature. It will not now appear surprising, that Mr. Belsham and his Unitarian associates are so extremely anxious to establish the apocryphal Gospel of the Nazarenes to be the true original Gospel of St. Matthew : for that Gospel, as *Jerem. Jones* (a favourite with the Unitarians) has shewn, in his *Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 376, has left us reason to believe, that

doubt not in his life, are exhibited strong traits of talent combined with amiable and virtuous feeling. The same freedom with which he has treated others, and with which, were he to offer any animadversions on these volumes,* his pen would be directed towards me, I have not scrupled to use with him. If I have misrepresented him, it certainly has not been my intention. His language I confess, has offended me, by its arrogance: and perhaps the feeling, which that would naturally excite, may have dictated a mode of reply, not always sufficiently respectful. If any thing like asperity or sarcasm has escaped me, I wish it to be considered, as applied to the cause, and to the manner of supporting it, rather than to the writer himself. His opinions, as undermining the best interests of human kind; and his style, like that of all the writers of the same side of the ques-

"Christ was a sinner, or at least that it is doubtful whether he was so or not." !!!

* It is now more than fourteen years since the first publication of this work: and, during that time, neither Mr. Belsham nor any of his learned Unitarian fellow labourers, have, as far as I know, favoured the public with any observations upon the arguments which it contains. Dr. Priestley, if I recollect rightly, about the year 1790, stated in one of the public prints, that, his *History of Early Opinions* having remained a long time unanswered, if the same silence should be observed during a limited period which he specified, he would consider it as an acknowledgment on the part of the whole Christian world that it was unanswerable. In this I will not presume to follow Dr. Priestley's example. It had better become Dr. Priestley to suppose, that his work had not received an answer, because it was not deemed of sufficient moment to demand one. It must surely become me to suppose the same of mine. At the same time, I cannot but rejoice, that its reception and circulation have been such as to give good reason to believe, that there is no small portion of the community to whom it appears to contain useful matter: and I shall certainly feel most sincere satisfaction, if it be allowed to continue to work its silent way without the noise and the exasperation of controversy.

tion, as tending to overbear by an imposing confidence of tone, and a familiar and frontless assumption of superiority, can scarcely be received without indignation,* or met without warmth. I do not pre-

* I cannot allow myself to employ the term, which Mr. B. does not scruple to combine with this, on much slighter provocation—"contempt." (Review, p. 64.) And yet—to pass from Mr. Belsham to the entire class of his fellow-labourers, and to speak not of the individual but of the cause at large and of its champions—what can be more fitly calculated, to excite even the feeling which that term expresses, than the impotent and arrogant attempts of a few loquacious sciolists, directed against the sublime and solid truths of Revelation? Bishop Watson, whose tolerant moderation is the subject of general praise, is forced to exclaim, that "it cannot but move one's indignation, to see a smattering in philosophy, urged as an argument, against the veracity of an Apostle." (Two Apologies, &c. p. 359.)—What shall be said, when the same sort of smattering is employed, to overturn the whole edifice of Christianity, to subvert the sanctioned wisdom of ages, and to overwhelm in one shapeless ruin the joint structure of learning and inspiration?—The Dean of Winchester, who is so justly distinguished for the brilliancy of his talents, the richness of his acquirements, and the eloquence and vigour of his style, has described the modern Socinianism, as "consisting of a train of whimsical paradoxes, the mere abortions of the mind! strange without originality, dull without sobriety, flippant without wit, and contagious without allurements." (Discourses on various Subjects, p. 145.)—A feature equally appropriate, and more offensive because more insulting and more mischievous, remains to be added to the picture; namely, an imposing affectation of superior knowledge without possessing any of its attainments. That grandest of all mischiefs, which an admired ancient has described as, *Αμαθία τις μάλα χαλίστη, δοκῶσα εἶναι μεγίστη Φρονήσις*, eminently belongs to the race of modern Socinians, or Unitarians as they choose to call themselves; and requires of course only to be unmasked in order to be put down. To this, I confess, my efforts (throughout this appendix especially) have been particularly directed: and so anxious have I been to effect this point, which in such a case I conceive to be vital, that I have not hesitated to expose myself to those imputations, which are generally cast upon the liberality and the politeness of the writer, who scruples not to press home truths in a direct manner, without fear, and without compro-

tend to have been free from the impression of these feelings. I trust however, I have not permitted them to carry me beyond the due limits. My object has been truth: and my wish, not unnecessarily to hurt the feelings of Mr. B. or of those, who with him assume the title of *Unitarians*. If, to the body of that denomination at large, I have attributed sentiments and opinions, which they do not recognise as justly imputable, it is to Mr. Belsham, not to me, they are to ascribe the error. My representation of their peculiar tenets, has been chiefly derived from the work, which he has given to the public with the express purpose of promulging, and vindicating, the creed of the *Unitarians*, or *Rational Christians*. If

mise. If I have had the good fortune to accomplish this object. I am satisfied to submit to whatever consequences may follow.

I am not, indeed, without the apprehension, that I may appear to assume somewhat too much in the application of the following passage from Bishop Warburton: and yet it approaches so nearly to the state of my own feelings, in winding up this appendix, that I cannot avoid transcribing it. In speaking of the particular manner, in which he had thought it right to treat the pernicious sophistries which were opposed to the fundamental truths of Christianity, that glowing and powerful writer thus expresses himself.—“He knows what the *gentle* reader thinks of it. But he is not one of those opposers of Infidelity, who can reason without earnestness, and confute without warmth. He leaves it to others, to the soft Divine, and courtly Controversialist, to combat the most flagitious tenets with serenity; or maintain the most awful of religious truths in a way, that misleads the unwary reader into an opinion of their making but little impression on the writer’s own heart. For himself, he freely owns, he is apt to kindle as he writes; and would even blush to repel an insult on sense and virtue with less vigour than every honest man is expected to shew in his own cause.”—Remarks on Hume’s Essay, &c. p. 12.

Such observations as have been added to the Appendix, since the appearance of the first Edition of this work, it has been thought right to introduce in the form of Notes, so as to leave the text (as it originally stood) unaltered.

he has not been a faithful interpreter of their opinions, it is theirs to correct the mistake. Hitherto that publication has been circulated, as the *Unitarian Manual*; and, whatever reception it may have experienced from others, has certainly *seemed* to obtain among that description of Christians, no small portion of applause.

ON THE UNITARIAN VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Mr. Belsham's engagement on behalf of the Unitarian critics, to which allusion has been made at pp. 182. 184 of this volume, has in fact been fulfilled by the Version of the New Testament, which has lately issued from the press; and which, as appears by a note on the beginning of the first Epistle of St. John, has been founded principally upon the labours of those able expositors and associates of Mr. Belsham, to whom we have been there referred. I hold myself therefore now bound, in point of justice, to retract, (so far at least as the New Testament is concerned) what I had ventured to pronounce, in pp. 135, 136. of Vol. I. concerning the unlikelihood of any Unitarian version of the Scripture being given to the public. It must however be confessed, that by what has been done, these Unitarian expositors have not much abridged the liberty for which they so strenuously contend. Their version is of that convenient latitude, that a person may at the same time, admit its authority, and yet disbelieve almost every doctrine, and every important truth of the Christian Revelation.

The Editors of this work have not, it must be observed, conducted themselves in the publication of it, with that manly boldness, which they are at all times, so ambitious to put forward, as their distinguishing characteristic. They have on the contrary

not scrupled to adopt one of those *pious frauds*, which they are pleased to consider the ordinary expedients of their orthodox opponents. The name of a Bishop of the Established Church was calculated to lull suspicion, and to contribute to a more extended circulation; and, accordingly, this *Improved Version*, which they have now sent abroad, they profess to found upon the basis of *Archbishop Newcome's translation* of the New Testament; whilst, in truth, they adopt no part of that translation, which in any degree shackles them in point of doctrine, but abide by it in such places only as are of a nature perfectly indifferent. They have thus contrived to give a respectable name to their Unitarian blasphemies. They thus hold out deceitful colours to the unwary, and vend their poisons under a false label.

To give any adequate idea of the nature of this *Improved Version* within the limits to which we are here necessarily confined, would be impossible. The reader may easily conceive that the whole apparatus of "interpolations, omissions, false readings, mistranslations, and erroneous interpretations," on which, as we have seen, Mr. Belsham places so firm a reliance, has been fully brought to bear, and has most thoroughly performed its work, in the forging of this last great production of the Unitarian foundry. A few particulars however, which may suffice to give some faint notion of the design and execution of the performance, I cannot but advert to.

In the Introduction of the work (p. v.) we are fairly apprised, that it has been a principal part of its design, to "divest the sacred volume of the technical phrases of a systematic theology."—That is, in other words, we are told, that the great object has been, so to render the New Testament, as to empty it of all such expressions, as might give support to any of the received and peculiar doctrines of

Christianity. This appears pretty manifestly to be what is here intended: for agreeably to this, we find, that all those phrases, which in any way connect with the unscriptural notions, of the *miraculous conception*, the *pre-existence*, and the *divinity of Christ*,—the *personal existence*, *divine nature* and *gracious influences of the Holy Spirit*,—the *existence of evil spirits and angels*, &c.—are all completely swept away; and nothing left to us, but what perfectly agrees with Mr. Belsham's idea,—that Christianity comprises a good moral system, with indeed the knowledge of this one fact, that a man has risen from the grave.—In the next place, we are told, what sufficiently explains how this has been effected. It is stated, that it has not been the intention, “to exhibit a version critically correct in every minute particular:” and that “*verbal criticism* had of course not been attended to in the degree that some might wish and expect.” p. vi.)—Thus we are fairly informed, that certain liberties are to be taken in the translation, to which the minuteness of verbal criticism might possibly present some impediment. That is, in a work, whose very object is to ascertain the exact meaning of words, the exact meaning of words is not to be attended to, lest it might embarrass the freedom of translation, and force upon the translator a sense different from that which he chooses to assign. Of what nature are those freedoms in translation, which have grown out of the facilities, and are adapted to the objects which the Editors have here planned for themselves, I shall now give two or three slight specimens.

The first which I shall mention, relates to the doctrine of the *Incarnation*, which is at once thrown off, by rejecting from the beginning of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the whole of what belongs to the miraculous birth of our Lord. This

has been done, it must be allowed, with sufficient boldness: for it is fairly admitted, that these portions of the Gospels “are to be found in all the MSS. and versions now extant.”—Now it is actually amusing to observe, what is the leading evidence, by which the Editors conceive themselves justified, thus to expunge from the canon of scripture, what has come supported by the testimony of *all* the Manuscripts and *all* the versions. With respect to the passage in Matthew, they tell us, that the *Ebionites* did not read the two first chapters in their copy of his Gospel; and with respect to St. Luke, they tell us, that *Marcion*, a heretic of the 2d century, did not admit the two first chapters of his. Therefore, it follows, that since the sect of the *Ebionites*, and the heretic *Marcion* of the 2d century, are against all the Manuscripts and all the Versions, it is impossible that these last can be received as true. The argument is certainly quite intelligible. But let us enquire a little about these irrefragable witnesses.

And, first, as to these *Ebionites*, we are informed, that their canon of the New Testament rejected the three last Gospels, and all the Epistles of St. Paul. And, next, as to this *Marcion*, we find, that he rejected the Old Testament, and every part of the New which contained quotations from the Old, and that he used no Gospel but that of St. Luke, expunging from this also whatever he did not approve: and we are told these things too, upon the very authority, on which the Editors build, respecting the omissions from St. Matthew and St. Luke.—Why then have not these admirers of *Marcion* and the *Ebionites*, received the testimony of such unimpeached witnesses throughout? Why have they not, on the authority of the latter, rejected all the New Testament except St. Matthew; or, on the authority of the former, rejected the entire of the Old Testa-

ment, and all the New excepting a part of St. Luke and some of the Epistles: or on the authority of both together, why have they not rejected the whole Bible, both Old and New Testament?—But it seems, that these witnesses are to be brought up and turned down at pleasure: they are both good and bad, according as may serve the present purpose. For, not only do we find, that they are not believed, by the party producing them, in any part of their testimony except that which relates to the beginnings of the two Gospels; but we find, that even in these, they are believed, only so far as is convenient: our Editors themselves admitting, that the *Ebionites* had mutilated the Gospel of St. Matthew, by *taking away the genealogy*; that is by taking away the first 16 verses of the first chapter. And therefore respecting these first 16 verses, the Editors reject the testimony of the *Ebionites* as being convicted of a mutilation of the Gospel; but as to the remaining verses of the first chapter and the whole of the second, they hold the testimony of these same *Ebionites* to be good, against all gain-sayers, against all Manuscripts, and against all Versions.—All this is put forward honestly and without any attempt at disguise. The Ebionite witnesses pronounced, on one side of a leaf, as not credible, from their acknowledged mutilation of the sacred text; and upon the other side of the same leaf, maintained to be witnesses of such repute, as ought to be relied upon, in opposition to all the MSS. and all the Versions of the New Testament in the whole world.

But that we may form a better judgment of the value of this Ebionite testimony according to the shewing of its Unitarian abettors, let us attend to a few more particulars on this head. The gospel of the Ebionites began, it is said, with these words, *It came to pass* IN THE DAYS OF HEROD KING OF JUDEA, *that*

JOHN CAME BAPTISING *with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan*. This the Editors distinctly state, in their third note, from the authority of Epiphanius; whilst, in the very note which precedes, they reject the text of St. Matthew, expressly because it places the birth of Christ before the death of Herod; which event, they contend from Luke iii. 23. must have taken place two years at least before Christ was born. Thus, the gospel ascribed to Matthew is spurious, because it fixes the birth of Christ before the death of Herod; and yet the gospel of the Ebionites, which fixes it not less than thirty years before that event, (inasmuch as it represents Herod to be alive at the commencement of the Baptist's ministry) is notwithstanding to be relied on as a genuine and indisputable document.

Yet farther,—for the Editors seem ambitious to make an overpowering display of the riches of their criticism on the first opening of their work,—they inform us from Epiphanius, that Cerinthus and Carpocrates argued from *the genealogy at the beginning of the Gospel*, that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary; whilst, at the same time, they acquaint us, that the gospel, which was used by Cerinthus and Carpocrates, was *the gospel of the Ebionites*, to which they admit no genealogy was prefixed, or from which (to use their own and Epiphanius's words) *the genealogy was taken away*. This, it will be confessed, is making a tolerably large demand upon the complaisance of the reader; yet there remains still more occasion for his courtesy, if he will travel on amicably with the Editors even through the first two pages of their translation.

The *genealogy* appears, upon the first view, to be a difficulty in their way, which they have themselves unnecessarily created. The Ebionites they have produced as their favourite witnesses, to as-

certain what was the true and original gospel of St. Matthew. But the Ebionites omit the entire of the first two chapters of that gospel. Why then injure their evidence by contending for the *genealogy*, which they reject? The reason is plainly assigned. The genealogy, as it stands, may answer the purpose of proving, that Jesus was the offspring of Joseph and Mary: and, accordingly, the Editors apprise us, that Cerinthus and Carpocrates applied it to this use, and hence deduced the mere humanity of Christ. They proceed also to shew the reasonableness of admitting the genealogy to be genuine, on the ground, that "it can hardly be supposed, that an author writing for the instruction of Hebrew Christians, would have omitted to trace the descent of Christ from Abraham and David, upon which they justly laid so great a stress." They then proceed to evince the like reasonableness of discarding all that follows the genealogy to the end of the second chapter. "This," (they say) "*COULD NOT have been written by the author of the genealogy, for it CONTRADICTS HIS DESIGN*, which was to prove, that Jesus, being the son of Joseph, was the descendant of Abraham and David; whereas the design of this narrative is to show, that Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus, was not his real father. This account therefore of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ must have been wanting in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates, as well as in those of the Ebionites: and *if the genealogy be genuine, this narrative MUST BE spurious.*"

Thus, then, the whole matter is completely arranged. The genealogy must be genuine as marking the human descent of Christ from Abraham and David, a thing expected by the Jews; and by all who received *it* as genuine, the narrative of the miraculous conception, as contradicting its design.

must be rejected as spurious. At the same time, lest we should imagine, that the force of this reasoning might have operated so powerfully upon those Hebrew Christians who received the genealogy and maintained the proper humanity of Christ as to induce them to *take away* the narrative which so directly contradicted the genealogy, in like manner as it is admitted others of them had *taken away* the genealogy itself, the Editors take care, in the very next note to assure us, that to that description of Christians "the account of the miraculous conception could not have been in any degree unacceptable:" "*nor would it*" (they add) "*at all have militated against the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ*, it being a fact analogous to the miraculous birth of Isaac, Samuel, and other eminent persons of the Hebrew nation." Thus, it appears, that the history of the miraculous conception, is itself something miraculous; for it at the same time *contradicts*, and yet *does not at all militate against*, the idea of Christ's human descent.

Now, perhaps, it may be doing no more than justice to these erudite and luminous commentators, to bring together into one point of view, the scattered lights, which have been here distinctly noticed; but which cannot fail from their combined brilliancy to shed a brighter glory upon the work which they are designed to illustrate.—1. The Ebionites and Marcion have omitted, in their respective copies of certain portions of scripture, passages, which are undoubtedly parts of the genuine sacred text; and the former (it is confessed) have actually *taken away* the genealogy from St. Matthew's gospel: the proof therefore, arising from their omission of whatever relates to the miraculous conception of Christ must be received as decisive against that fact, although it is admitted, that

the narratives of it, as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke, come attested by every manuscript and every version now extant without exception.—2. The gospel of St. Matthew, as it is conveyed to us at this day by all the MSS. and all the versions, cannot be genuine, because it requires us to believe, that our Lord was born before the death of Herod; but we may admit as unquestionable the gospel of the Ebionites, which pronounces Herod to be living at the commencement of the Baptist's ministry, or about the thirtieth year after our Lord's nativity. Lastly, the narrative of the miraculous conception ascribed to St. Matthew, must have been rejected by all who received the genealogy, as contradicting the design of the genealogy, which was to establish the human descent of Christ; at the same time that it is quite clear, that the fact of the miraculous conception could not at all have militated against the doctrine of the proper humanity of Christ, nor consequently have been in any degree unacceptable to those who held that doctrine.—Such are the new views presented at the opening of this Improved Version, which is to set every thing to rights in the Christian Scriptures. See pp. 1, 2, 3, 5. and also p. 121.

There are, moreover, certain chronological deductions connected with some of the foregoing observations, which I cannot avoid laying before the reader. Four pages back it has been stated, that the Editors contend, that *the death of Herod must have taken place two years at least before Christ was born*. Their mode of establishing this point is deserving of some detail. It follows, they say, as a necessary consequence from the death of Herod being placed (as it is by Lardner) in the year 750, or 751, U. C. Lardner, in the part referred to by the Editors (p. 129.) had asserted, that “if Herod

died in 750 U. C. he died *three years and nine months before the VULGAR CHRISTIAN ERA*; if at a certain time before mentioned in the year 751, then he died about *two years and nine months before the said era*:" and which is the truth, he professes himself unable to determine. (See Lardner's Works, vol. i. p. 428.) Our Editors, referring to Lardner (twice upon the same subject, at p. 2, and at p. 129.) contend peremptorily, that Christ "^{MUST HAVE BEEN BORN} *at least two years and nine months, and probably three years and nine months, after the death of Herod*:" and thus, in utter disregard of all the arguments by which the Vulgar Christian Era has been disproved, or rather with an apparent ignorance of the existence of any such arguments, they have at once assumed the vulgar and the true era of our Lord's nativity to be the same; and on this assumption, as in itself sufficient to invalidate the whole story of our Lord's birth as given by St. Matthew, they build the rejection of that story as an utter fabrication. They profess at the same time to ground their reasoning on the authority of Lardner; whose main object has been to establish the direct reverse of their position,—that Christ "must have been born two years at least after the death of Herod;"—inasmuch as, with great learning and sound argument, he has laboured to demonstrate the consistency of St. Luke's declaration respecting the age of Christ in the 15th of Tiberius, with the narrative of St. Matthew which places the birth of Christ about two years before the death of Herod. (Lardner's Works, vol. i. p. 339—382.) That learned writer, however, in his "Appendix concerning the time of Herod's death," has, unfortunately for our Editors, in the passage above referred to, spoken of the Vulgar Christian Era, as posterior to the death of Herod: and they, substituting for the *Vul-*

gar Christian Era, the *time of Christ's nativity*, have at once inferred the priority of Herod's death to the birth of Christ; and have adduced the authority of Lardner's name in behalf of a position, which Lardner has most triumphantly overthrown.

A similar instance of careful reference to authorities, and of minute attention to the accuracies of ecclesiastical history, is presented to us in the very front of this elaborate performance, which I cannot avoid adverting to in this place. The Editors, whilst dealing out in their Introduction large portions of that knowledge of manuscripts and the various critical apparatus for the translation of the New Testament, which Wetstein, Michaelis, Griesbach and others had already amply supplied, take occasion to speak of Ephrem the Syrian, as "a writer of SOME NOTE in the SIXTH century." (P. xiv.) In this at least they have thought and spoken for themselves: the commonly received opinion having hitherto been, that Ephrem flourished about the *middle of the FOURTH century*. From Asseman we learn, that he was present at the council of Nice, in the year 325: and we are told by Jerome, that he died in the time of the Emperor Valens, that is, at some time before the year 379. We are also informed by the early authorities, that this same Ephrem, who is here so slightly glanced at as "*a writer of some note*," was a person of the most distinguished celebrity: a man, of whom Jerome says, "*ad tantam venit claritudinem, ut post lectionem scripturarum publice in quibusdam ecclesiis ejus scripta recitentur*:" who is described by Ebedjesu, a learned Syrian of the 13th century, "*Ephræm magnus, qui appellatus est Syrorum propheta*:" who was even entitled by the Syrians, "the doctor of the whole world;" and who, in truth, with the consent of all who have hitherto made mention of him, has been estimated as one of

the most illustrious divines and writers in the century in which he lived, that is, as we have seen in the *fourth century*. The Editors of the Improved Version, however, acquaint us, that he was "*a writer of some note in the sixth century*." It is the less pardonable, I may add, in these Editors, to have been thus inattentive in the case of Ephrem; as he is reported (Lardner, vol. ii. pp. 419, 420.) to have written a commentary upon the Harmony of Titian, a writer, whom the Unitarians have been at all times anxious (though most unfoundedly indeed) to claim as an auxiliary to their cause. (See Williams's Free Inquiry, p. 60—66.)

I need not, I think, go much farther upon this subject.—I shall however touch briefly upon two or three points more. The beginnings of the gospels, (at least of three of them,) have always been found sadly troublesome to Unitarians. Matthew and Luke however, have now been forced to part with theirs. This could not be so easily effected with regard to St. John. We have no *Ebionite* or *Marcion* appropriate to his use. But we have what just answers as well, a Unitarian expositor.—For example. "The word was in the beginning, and the word was with GOD, and the word was A GOD." The word then is found not to be GOD, but only A GOD. But again, lest, as being A GOD, it might still by possibility be supposed, that the formation of the world has been ascribed to this word in the verse which follows, we are told that "all things were DONE by him; and without him was not any thing DONE, that was DONE?" that is, says the note, "all things in the christian dispensation were done by Christ; i. e. by his authority,—the word *γινωσκει* never signifying to create."—Well; but then we come to the 10th verse, in which we find the words, *Ο κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*. This, to common readers, would indicate, that the

world was created by this word. But as we have seen above, that *παντα εγενοντο* must be rendered, "all things were DONE by him;" of course it must follow here, that "*the world* was DONE by him:" let these words mean what they may. No such thing, after all. Our expositor tells us, that the only true rendering is, "the world was *enlightened* by him." And thus the whole matter of the Divinity of Christ, and his creation of the world, are cleared away from the introduction of St. John's Gospel. For, it must be observed, that in the opening clause (*In the Beginning was the Word*) nothing indicative of Christ's *pre-existence* is contained; inasmuch as the *beginning* here means simply (we are told) "the commencement of the gospel dispensation, or of the ministry of Christ." The whole, then, as duly explained by these critics, stands thus: *Christ* (for so they admit THE WORD is to be understood) *was from the commencement of the ministry of Christ; and Christ withdrew to commune with God, and to receive instructions for his ministry; and Christ was a God.* For the excellent and strictly classical reasons assigned for these improvements upon the common version, I refer to this profoundly learned work itself, pp. 199, 200. If the reader should not be altogether satisfied with those reasons, he will however be pleased to recollect, that the Editors have given fair notice, that it was not their intention to condescend to the "minuteness of verbal criticism."

I shall content myself with one specimen more of the qualifications of the Editors for the work which they have undertaken. I have given one, as an example of their accuracy, in ascertaining the genuine text of Scripture: a second as an example of their precision in reference to historical dates: a third, as an example of their attention to the minutiae

of Ecclesiastical history: a fourth, as an example of their acumen, in detecting the precise signification of the original language; and this will serve as an example of the justness of their inferences on general principles of reasoning. Acts vii. 60, we find St. Stephen addressing his prayers to Jesus Christ,—“Lord Jesus receive my spirit;” and,—“Lord lay not this to their charge.” On these passages, our expositors favour us with the following just distinction and salutary caution. This address of Stephen to Jesus, when he actually saw him, does not authorize us to offer prayers to him, NOW HE IS INVISIBLE:” and for farther explanation they refer to Mr. Lindsey, who states the matter thus. “Unquestionably Stephen addressed this prayer to the Lord Jesus. But this can be no precedent for directing prayer to him *unseen*, or addressing him as God, whom the blessed martyr declares he *saw with his eyes*, and calls him *the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God*; calls him the SON OF MAN, in that his highest state of exaltation.”—Apology, &c. p. 129.—This reasoning is quite invincible, and contains in it a mine of valuable matter, which does not at first sight present itself. Jesus must, it is evident, be a *mere man*, or he could not have been seen by Stephen in bodily form, “standing on the right hand of God,” nor have been called by him the Son of Man.—(“Behold I see the Heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God.”) He might then of course be worshipped and prayed to, whilst he was plainly *visible as a man*. But when he ceased to appear as a man, he ought no longer to be addressed in prayer. Or perhaps generally speaking, it is meant, that no being that is invisible can properly be an object of worship. How all the arguments which Popery has ever devised, in defence of *image wor-*

ship, fade and vanish, in comparison of the bright and overpowering evidence, which this reasoning supplies!

By this time the reader must be sufficiently aware of the great value, of this *Improved version of the New Testament*: and it may accordingly be safely dismissed; more particularly as Dr. Nares' valuable Remarks render all farther criticism upon the work nearly superfluous. And yet before I finally take my leave of it, I must do it the justice to say, that there are criticisms, the production of certain Unitarian commentators, which are too bold even for *its* adoption. Of this, one striking instance is to be found in the translation of Acts xx. 28. in which the Editors prefer the safer mode of evading the admission of our Lord's divinity, by reading *Κυριον* instead of *Θεου*, *Lord* instead of *God*. Mr. Wakefield, on the contrary, contends strenuously for *Θεου*, and afterwards effects his escape from the consequence, by proposing two of the most extraordinary criticisms that were ever ventured by a Greek scholar. *Του ιδιου αιματος*, he renders, not *his own blood*, but *his own son*, because truly a man's son may be said to be *his own blood*; and therefore, the son of God may be expressed by God's own BLOOD,—an expression, which had it been used of GOD THE FATHER by a *Trinitarian* in defence of his doctrine, would have subjected him to Mr. Wakefield's ineffable contempt. Mr. W. supplies also another mode of getting rid of the difficulty, (that is, the difficulty of acknowledging the divinity of our Lord,) viz. that of translating the words, "by the blood of his own," (supplying the word *Son*.)—This, observe, is the rendering of *δια του ιδιου αιματος*. So much for the most celebrated scholar of the modern Unitarian school which England has produced. —The reader will be rewarded for his trou-

ble in looking into Middleton's Doctrine of the Greek Article, p. 418—428, on this passage. In truth, I refer most willingly to this work, as one which will supply to the scripture student, some of the most valuable helps to the critical investigation of the Text of the New Testament, which can be derived from any modern publication.

ON THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

Having been led, in the foregoing observations, to advert to the rejection, by the Unitarian Editors, of the portion which follows the genealogy in the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, I deem it not unadvisable to offer here a few remarks upon the subject of those chapters, which, without going at length into the proof of their authenticity, will, I trust, be found sufficient to supply at once a satisfactory assurance on that head. Dr. Marsh, in his ninth lecture observes, that if we turn to the second volume of Griesbach's *Symbolæ Criticæ*, we shall find a quotation from the *first* chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, and a reference to the *second*, made by Celsus the Epicurean philosopher, which quotation and reference are noted by Origen, who wrote in answer to Celsus. Griesbach, he adds, justly remarks, "*Hinc patet duo priora Matthæi capita, Celso nota fuisse.*" And with no less justice on his own part, he deduces the following inference; that if Celsus, who wrote his celebrated work against the Christians in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and consequently little more than an hundred years after St. Matthew himself wrote, yet found the first two chapters in *his* manuscript of St. Matthew's Gospel, those chapters must either have been *original* parts of St. Matthew's Gospel, or they must have been added at a time so little antecedent to the age

of Celsus, that a writer so inquisitive, so sagacious, and at the same time so inimical to Christianity, could not have failed to *detect* the imposture. But that, in this case, he would not have quoted those chapters as parts of St. Matthew's Gospel. And consequently, that the truth must lie in the *other* part of the dilemma, namely, that those chapters are authentic.—Course of Lectures, Part. ii. pp. 55, 56.

To this reasoning of the learned and able professor nothing can be added, which will give greater force to his conclusion. In point of fact, however, it is important to observe, that we are not left to a single quotation from the *first*, and a single reference to the *second* chapter of St. Matthew, for the proof that these two chapters were known to and admitted by Celsus. In truth we find, from Origen's refutation of that author's charges against Christianity, that his references to those chapters were so numerous as nearly to supply a perfect detail of the facts which *they* relate. See Origen against Celsus, pp. 108. 119. 125, 134. 139. 184. 189. 192. 208. The reader who may dislike the trouble of referring to Origen's work for the proof of this, will probably acquiesce in the following recapitulation given by Lardner of the testimony borne by Celsus to the facts recorded in the first two chapters of St. Matthew.

“We learn from him” (Celsus) “that Christ was born of a virgin, in a small village of Judea, supposed to have been descended from the Jewish kings: that she was married to a carpenter: that for some while her husband was doubtful about her chastity: that Chaldeans, or other wise men from the East, came to Jerusalem soon after his nativity, to do him homage as King of the Jews, having been excited to that journey by the appearance of a star: that Herod moved by jealousy, put to death many young

children, hoping to kill Jesus with them: that by direction of an angel he was carried by his parents into Egypt for the preservation of his life; where, as Celsus insinuates, Jesus learned the charms practised in that country. He calls Jesus the Nazaræan man, or man of Nazareth, from the place where he was brought up and chiefly resided before his appearance in a public character."—See Lardner's Works, vol. viii. pp. 10. 11. 19—22. 58, 59. and for a yet more particularized detail by Dr. Doddridge, see *ibid* p. 63.

Now what is this, but an abridgment of the history given by the Evangelist? Indeed the testimony thus borne by Celsus is so irresistible, that its application is not denied even by the writers, who most strenuously oppose themselves to the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel. Thus, Dr. Williams, in his *Free Enquiry*, p. 49. when urging his objections strongly against those chapters, asserts, that "we have no *certain* references or allusions to them, *till* the days of Celsus the Epicurean, about the year 150 or later." That the reference made by Celsus to these chapters is *certain* and *undoubted*, is then, plainly admitted. As to the *lateness* of that reference, the drawback thence arising will not be considered very formidable, when it is recollected, that the date of Celsus's work is not removed from that of St. Matthew's Gospel by more than one hundred years, nor from the death of St. John by more than fifty; and when in addition to this, the remarks already quoted by Dr. Marsh are held in remembrance. But imaginary as this drawback is, yet cannot even this be conceded to Dr. Williams; the very reverse of his allegation being the truth. For we *do* find *certain* references to the first two chapters of St. Matthew *before* the date of Celsus's work.

In the first place, we find them numerous and decisive in the writings of Justin Martyr: so much so indeed, as nearly to supply a recapitulation of all the facts related in those chapters; and in such language as clearly to prove, that from those chapters the information of the writer was principally derived. The very words also of St. Matthew are sometimes quoted with a precision so unequivocal as to determine the source of the quotations. Passages and phrases which occur in St. Matthew only, and applications of the prophecies of Isaiah, Micah and Jeremiah, which are made by no other Evangelist, are adopted by Justin; and adopted by him with a literal adherence to St. Matthew's text; and, what renders the demonstration perfect, with a literal adherence in those very citations from the Old Testament, in which St. Matthew has departed from the words both of the Hebrew and the Septuagint. (See Just. Mart. pp. 53, 54. 304—307, and the observations upon these parts of Justin, p. 220—224 of this volume.) These references to St. Matthew are contained in Justin's First Apology, presented by him to the Emperor Antoninus Pius in the beginning of his reign, and in his Dialogue with Trypho; both of which are supposed by the best Commentators to have been written about the year 140. Thus we have travelled nearer to the age of the Apostles; and in truth we come nearer still, if we consider that Justin's testimony, though not published till the year 140, may fairly be carried back to the period at which he became a Christian; inasmuch as we must suppose him at that time well acquainted with the Christian scriptures, which must in fact have been the means of his conversion; and consequently cannot easily imagine, that what was not then conceived to form a part of St. Matthew's Gospel, could be afterwards received by him as such.

In this view of the case, the authority of Justin's testimony reaches backwards nearly to the year 130.

To a date equally early may be referred the testimony of the Composer, (or perhaps I might more properly say) the Christianizer of the Sibylline Oracles; who, as Lardner justly observes, was manifestly acquainted with the first two chapters of St. Matthew. For a few extracts from this work, see pp. 225. 226 of this volume. The objection, that this collection, or at least a part of it, was the forgery of a Christian writer, instead of detracting from its value, supplies the very circumstance, which renders it admissible as evidence in the cause; since, otherwise, (were it, what it professes to be, strictly prophetic,) its similarity to any other written document could afford no proof of that document's previous existence. The only point, which it is important to establish, is the date to be assigned to this collection: and, that it existed from an early period of the second century, may be fairly deduced from the authorities collected by Lardner. Celsus makes the interpolation of these Oracles a subject of reproach against Christians. And Justin quotes them in matters relating to Christian doctrine. I shall not, however, dwell upon the testimony, which these writings present; but proceed to that, which brings us back within the limits of the Apostolic age, and which offers itself with an authority not inferior to that of Apostolic origin. I mean the testimony of Ignatius.

This Apostolic father, who suffered martyrdom at Rome in the tenth of Trajan, that is, in the year 107, (See Lardner, vol. ii. p. 69.) we find, in his (genuine) Epistle to the Ephesians, plainly referring to the history of the Virgin Mary's miraculous conception of our Lord, and to the appearance of

the star which so wonderfully announced his birth. (See Patr. Apost. vol. ii. pp. 38. 94. 110. 112. 114.) In the larger Epistle also, (ibid. part 4. p. 78.) we find an exact quotation of the passage in Matth. i. 23: on which, however, I will not lay particular stress, as the larger Epistles of this Father are, and not unjustly, suspected of interpolation, and therefore this quotation may possibly be of spurious origin. We have now travelled back within about forty years from the publication of St. Matthew's Gospel; and we have the testimony of a cotemporary and associate of the Apostles, one who outlived the Apostle John but by six or seven years, who had received the teaching of the Apostles, who had been appointed by the Apostles themselves to the Bishopric of Antioch, the first and oldest Christian church among the Gentiles; appointed to it within less than ten years from the date of St. Matthew's Gospel, (see Lardner, vol. ii. p. 66.) and who himself, like the Apostles, died a martyr to the truth of the religion which he professed. We have, then, in fact, what amounts to Apostolic testimony for the truth and authenticity of the disputed chapters of St. Matthew. Yet, strange to say, a deficiency in this very respect has been alleged as an objection against their authenticity.

It is urged by Dr. Williams, that the *silence* of the Apostolical Fathers supplies an argument of this nature. It is true, indeed, he does not here mean to include Ignatius, having made *his* testimony the subject of a distinct enquiry. He speaks only of the other Fathers; and, of these, he adds that, without which their silence could afford no semblance of an argument whatever; namely, that they "often cite and refer to other parts of St. Matthew's Gospel, and had frequent occasion in their debates with Jewish unbelievers, to refer, also, to the first and

second chapters, had they known or acknowledged them to be genuine." (Free Enq. p. 103.) And in another place (p. 93.) he says, that "as these Fathers frequently had occasion to speak of the family and birth of Christ, it is hardly credible, that none of them should have referred to those chapters, had they been extant, and acknowledged to be the composition of St. Matthew."

Now, the direct opposite of both the assertions herein contained is precisely the fact. For, in the first place, the references made by these Fathers to St. Matthew's Gospel are extremely few: and, in the next place, they are in no part of their writings engaged in any debate or discussion whatever on the subject of the birth of Christ: (both of which points shall be more particularly adverted to at the conclusion of these remarks.) So that were any inference to be drawn from the silence of these Fathers upon the subjects contained in the first two chapters of St. Matthew, it should rather be, that on those subjects no controversies existed at that day, the facts related in those chapters being acquiesced in without dispute: this, I say, should be the natural inference, when we find the facts familiarly alluded to by the only one of the Apostolical Fathers whose subject led him to refer to them,—Ignatius; and again by Justin, who immediately succeeded the times of those fathers, and who in truth wrote both his First Apology and his Dialogue with Trypho before the death of one of them, namely Polycarp.

Many have been the occasions, on which I have found myself compelled, in the course of these volumes, to protest against the disingenuousness of Unitarian critics in their treatment of ancient authorities; but, perhaps, there is no one, against whom such a protest is more loudly demanded, than

against the writer whose objections I have been engaged in noticing.—The foregoing observations, coupled with those which will be found subjoined to these remarks, will probably appear to most readers sufficient to substantiate this charge; and yet they supply but a small part of what might be adduced in its support. At the same time, it remains to be remarked, that, notwithstanding the strained exertions of this writer against the authenticity of the introductory chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, he affords but very imperfect aid to the Editors of the Unitarian Version; inasmuch as his arguments are principally directed against the genealogy, which they retain as genuine; and the proofs, by which he endeavours to overturn St. Matthew's relation of the circumstances attending the miraculous nativity of our Lord, are built upon the assumed genuineness of the history of the same event as given by St. Luke: so that, if Dr. Williams be right in his results, the Editors are wrong in theirs; wrong in retaining the genealogy of St. Matthew, and wrong in rejecting the first two chapters of St. Luke.

But to return to our immediate subject. We have seen that the testimony supporting the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Matthew carries us back to the age of the Apostles. A farther confirmation is had from the Syriac Version, whose date is justly referred to the same early age, and in which, as in every other Version of St. Matthew, (including the *Old Italic*, whose antiquity is also unquestionable,) those two chapters are found to exist. And that evidence should not be wanting from any description of the early writers, we have the testimony of a *Hebrew* Christian, *Hegesippus*; who, as Eusebius informs us, was amongst the first successors of the Apostles; and who is described by Gobar, as *Ἀρχαῖος τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικός*. In a

fragment of this writer, we have a reference to part of the history in the second chapter of St. Matthew; from which Lardner pronounces, that it "appears plainly, that this part of St. Matthew's Gospel was owned by this Hebrew Christian:" so that, he adds, "he must either have used our Greek Gospel, or if he used only the Hebrew edition of St. Matthew, this history must have been in it in his time." (Lard. Works, vol. ii. p. 143.)

How then stands the evidence upon the whole? The Syriac Version, which is one of Apostolical antiquity, and the Old Italic, both contain the two chapters. Ignatius, the only Apostolical Father who had occasion to make reference to them, does so. The Sibylline oracles do the same. Justin Martyr does the same. Celsus, the bitter enemy of the Christian faith, does the same. Hegesippus, a Hebrew Christian, does the same. Irenæus, and all the fathers who succeed him, it is admitted on all hands, do the same. And the chapters are at this day found in every manuscript and every version of the Gospel of St. Matthew which is extant throughout the world. Thus we have one continued and unbroken series of testimony from the days of the Apostles to the present time; and, in opposition to this, we find only a vague report of the state of a Hebrew copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, said to be received amongst an obscure and unrecognised description of Hebrew Christians, who are admitted, even by the very writers who claim the support of their authenticity, to have mutilated the copy which they possessed, by removing the genealogy.

I should not have dwelt so long upon a subject, which is at this day so fully ascertained as the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, did it not furnish a fair opportunity of exhibiting the species of evidence, which Unitarian

critics are capable of resisting; and the sort of arguments, with which they do not scruple to resist it.

I have mentioned above, that the first two chapters of St. Matthew are found in all the unmutilated MSS. that are extant. To those hitherto commonly known, a late discovery in the library of the University of Dublin enables me to add the testimony of one more, and that of considerable antiquity. For this discovery the public is indebted to the great industry and accurate research of the Rev. Doctor Barret, now Vice-Provost of Trinity College. This manuscript, which is a *codex rescriptus*, contains the Gospel of St. Matthew in the most ancient Greek character, of which a fac simile has been published by the University: and it has been satisfactorily shewn by the learned Editor not to be of later date than the sixth century. In this MS. we find the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, with the exception of some parts wanting from mutilation: namely, the first sixteen verses of the first chapter, and from the seventh to the twelfth and from the twentieth to the twenty-third verse of the second chapter.—It is a circumstance worthy of observation, that Dr. Williams, speaking of this manuscript, of which he had received an account previous to its publication, observes, “no information concerning *our enquiry* can be derived from this manuscript.” (Free Enq. p. xxi.) Now the course of the enquiry had been to discover MSS. that could justify the *rejection* of the first two chapters of St. Matthew, or at least of the genealogy. For that purpose, undoubtedly, this MS. could yield no information: but for that, which ought to be the purpose of an enquirer, it affords full information; viz. information of the fact, that at the date of the manuscript, the genealogy and the whole of the first two chapters of St. Matthew were deemed by its

writer to be authentic, and were found as a genuine part of the Gospel in the MS. from which it was copied.

In support of what has been asserted (pp. 213. 214.) concerning *Justin Martyr's* reference to St. Matthew's Gospel, the following remarks will probably be deemed satisfactory.

The quotation from Isaiah vii. 14, by Justin Martyr, is as follows: Ἰδου ἡ παρθενος ἐν γαστρὶ ἐξει, καὶ τεξέται υἱόν· καὶ ἐρουσὶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός. (p. 53.) In another place (p. 223.) this is quoted with some little variation, ληψεται being read for ἐξει, and there being added after υἱόν, the words καὶ καλεσεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ. Now St. Matthew, and he only of the writers of the New Testament, has quoted this prophecy. Both he and Justin quote it in the same application. Both quote it in the *third* person, instead of the *second*, (*thou shalt call*,) in which it is given by both the Hebrew and Septuagint of the Prophet: and, what is most remarkable, both annex the interpretation of *Emmanuel* in the very same words, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός, *God with us*. So that, upon the whole, there can be no reasonable doubt of Justin's having taken the quotation from St. Matthew; as well from their mutual agreement in general, as from their common departure from, and common addition to, the text of the Prophet as it stands both in the Hebrew and the Greek.

Again, in p. 54, Justin relates the declaration of the Angel to the Virgin in the manner described both by St. Matthew and St. Luke; and, having, through the first part of it, used the expressions of both indifferently, he concludes with these words, καὶ καλεσεὶς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν

λαον αυτου απο των αμαρτιων αυτων; which last clause contains the very words of St. Matthew; words to be found in no other writer of the New Testament. Justin, moreover, to prove that he was giving a quotation from the Evangelists, adds, “as *they* have taught us, who have written the history of all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ:” hereby clearly announcing, that he derived his information from more than one of the sacred historians, and therefore manifestly pointing out both St. Matthew and St. Luke, who only of the sacred historians had related the story of the angel’s address to Mary. And yet, what is Dr. Williams’ observation upon this passage of Justin?—“The words supposed to be here cited from St. Matthew, are, *for he shall save his people from their sins*. This, however, is by no means certain; for all the other parts of the quotation are taken out of St. Luke, though in a manner somewhat disordered. These words, therefore, may be no more than a *loose citation*, by memory, from St. Luke, or a reference to some other passages of the same writer, see Acts iv. 12. x. 43. The *thought* occurs in a variety of places in the New Testament; so that we are not necessarily obliged to conclude that there is an allusion to St. Matthew, and to no other Evangelist.” He adds also, in a note, that “the manner in which the writers of the New Testament make citations from the old, plainly shews that they often quoted from memory.” (Free Enq. p. 98.)—Here is surely most extraordinary reasoning. The *very* words of St. Matthew, *to a letter*, are used by Justin. The same words are employed by no other writer of the New Testament. And yet, there is reason to think, that this precise repetition of St. Matthew is not a quotation from him, but rather a *loose citation* from St. Luke, who has not used any terms resembling them. And.

because the *thought* occurs in various places of the New Testament, we are not obliged to conclude, that there is an allusion to St. Matthew, who is the only writer that has used the *words*: and this too, although Justin tells us, that he quotes from the Evangelists, at the same time that it must be admitted, that no other but Matthew and Luke can be alluded to; the one of whom does not at all employ the words in question, and the other does most accurately.

Dr. Williams, indeed, in a note, adds, that “Justin also *seems* to allude to the Arabian Magi, Matth. ii. 11. in his dialogue with Trypho, p. 315, &c. but it may be only an allusion to a common tradition.” (Free Enq. p. 98.)—Now the reader will be surprised to learn, that this *seeming* allusion to the passage in Matth. ii. 11. concerning the Arabian Magi, is almost an exact transcript of that part of St. Matthew’s history, and in several places conveyed in the very words of St. Matthew. The Magi, speaking of the king, whose birth was signified by the appearance of the star, tell Herod in the precise terms of the Evangelist, *και ηλθομεν προσκυνησαι αυτον*: and having come to Bethlehem, and fallen down and worshipped the young child, they are described by Justin as bringing their gifts, in the very language of St. Matthew; *προσενεγκαν αυτω δωρα. χρυσον, και λιβανον και σμυρναν*: and again, being warned in a vision not to return to Herod, they are described by Justin, as returning into their own country by a different way, in almost the very words of the Evangelist likewise, *δι’ αλλης οδου εις την χωραν αυτων*. See Matth. ii. 2. 11, 12. and Justin, pp. 304, 305. 307. which last pages, indeed, whoever reads, will be instantly satisfied, that St. Matthew is scarcely out of the view of the writer in a single line. It is true, indeed, that it is not to this part of Justin that

Dr. Williams has referred, when he has spoken of the *seeming* allusion to the Magi, but to p. 315. C. Colon. 1686: that is, to p. 330 of the edition here cited. But why did not Dr. Williams take care to inform himself of what Justin did say, before he ventured to pronounce what he did not say. More however yet remains. We find in this history, as given by Justin, two prophecies applied, which are applied by none else but St. Matthew; and we find also, that these prophecies are cited in the words of St. Matthew, and not in those of the prophets by whom they were delivered. What can be proof, if this be not?—1. In like manner as in St. Matthew, we here find Herod, when alarmed by the report of the wise men, consulting the scribes and elders; who inform him, that Christ was to be born in Bethlehem, for that the Prophet had said, *Και συ Βεθλεεμ γη Ιουδα. ουδαιως ελαχιση ει εν τοις ηγεμοσιν Ιουδα, εκ σου γαρ εξελευσεται ηγουμενος οςις ποιμανει τον λαον μου.* See Matt. ii. 6, and Justin, pp. 55. 305. Now, in this citation of the prophecy, the Evangelist and the Martyr agree in every letter; whilst the prophecy itself, as given by the LXX. runs differently thus; *Και συ Βεθλεεμ οικος του Εφραθα, ολιγοζος ει του ειναι εν χιλιασιν Ιουδα. εκ σου μοι εξελευσεται ηγουμενος του ειναι εις αρχοντα εν τω Ισραηλ.* Alex.—2. When describing the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem, and the consequent fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy, Justin thus quotes the prophecy: *Φωνη εν Ραμα ηκουσθη, κλαυθμος και οδυρμος πολυς. Ραχηλ κλαιουσα τα τεκνα αυτης, και ουκ ηθελε παρακληθηναι οτι ουκ εισι.* See Justin, p. 307. and Matt. ii. 18. Here also, we have a complete agreement between Justin and St. Matthew, with this single exception, that the words *δρηνος και*, found in the common readings of St. Matthew, are here wanted. But it should be at the same time noted, that these words

are likewise wanted in some manuscripts and many versions of St. Matthew; and that Griesbach marks them as most probably to be expunged from the text of the Evangelist. Now, on the other hand, how stands the prophecy itself, as rendered by the Seventy? Φωνη εν Ραμα ηκουσθη θρηνον, και κλαυθμον, και οδυρμον. Ραχηλ αποκλαιομενης επι των υιων αυτης, και ουκ ηθελευ παρακληθηναι, οτι ουκ εισιν.—Alex.—or, as in Vatic. αποκλαιομενη ουκ ηθελε πανσασθαι επι τοις υιοις αυτης, οτι ουκ εισιν.—These remarkable passages in Justin, it must be observed, have been altogether unnoticed by Dr. Williams.—What then, upon the whole, is to be judged, concerning the likelihood of Justin's having quoted from St. Matthew, and concerning the accuracy of Dr. Williams' examination of this subject,—it cannot be necessarily further to discuss.

At p. 214 of this volume, the Sibylline Oracles have been referred to. A few extracts from those oracles are here subjoined. In the eighth book are to be found several passages relating to the nativity of Christ. The angel Gabriel is there described, as visiting Mary the mother of our Lord, and foretelling the miraculous production of the Saviour: and the birth of this illustrious deliverer, at Bethlehem, of a virgin mother, is at length detailed. To this detail is added what follows.

Καινοφανης δε μαγισσι σιζασθι θισφατος αστηρ.
 Σπαργανοις δε ερεφος δε χθι θεοπειθισι φατην.
 Και λογος η Βεθλεμ πατρις θεοκλητος ελεχθι
 Βασιλαταις τε και αιρονομαις και ποιμεσιν αγνων.—p. 258.

In the same work also, at p. 65, we find the incarnation of the Son of God; and the name, Ιησους,

by which, in his human form, he was to be known to men, thus described :

Δι τότε καὶ μεγαλοῦ Θεοῦ παῖς ἀνθρώποιςιν
 Ἦξει σαρκοφόρος, θνητοῖς ὑμαιομένης ἐν γῇ.
 Τέσσαρ' φανήντα φέρει· τα δὲ ἀφ' αὐτῶ.

Dr. Williams refers to both the above passages; and admits, that there are *many* which relate to the birth of Christ. Yet he contends, that they are *all* evidently taken from St. Luke's Gospel, one only excepted; namely, that one first cited above, which states, that "the wondrous new star that appeared was revered by the wise men:" and this he endeavours to explain away, as being derivable from the general tradition, and therefore not necessarily to be traced to St. Matthew's Gospel. (Free Enq. p. 97.)—Dr. Williams has, however, been rather unfortunate in the assertion, that every circumstance noticed in this work concerning the history of Christ, with the single exception just made, is taken from the Gospel of St. Luke. Had he examined the Sibylline Oracles for himself, and not contented himself with looking to the extracts given by Lardner, he would have discovered his assertion to be untenable; he would have found one passage, at least, alluding to a fact not recorded by St. Luke, nor by any Evangelist but St. Matthew, that of the preservation of the infant Jesus by the flight into Egypt.

τότε σημεῖα ἔροισιν
 Ἔσται εξαφνης, ὅποταν πεφυλαγμένος ἦξη
 Ἐκ γῆς Αἰγυπτίου καλὸς λίθος. ἐν δ' ἀρ. τέτα
 Λίθος περικ. φει ἐσθλίων, ἐννι δ' ἀγρεύονται
 Αὐτὴ υφηγησιν.—pp. 65, 66.

It has been asserted at p. 216, that "the references made by the Apostolical Fathers to St. Matthew's Gospel are extremely few;" and that, (with

an exception in the case of Ignatius) "these Fathers are, in no part of their writings, engaged in any debate or discussion whatever on the subject of the *birth* of Christ." The truth of these positions will be manifest on a short review. The Apostolical Fathers are *five*, Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius and Polycarp. Now, first, as to St. Barnabas; the greatest number of *possible* references made by this Father to St. Matthew's Gospel amounts to *eight*: and, in the opinion of Lardner, those, that may with any strength of probability be considered as such, do not exceed *four*, viz. Matth. xvi. 24; xx. 16; v. 42; ix. 13. And neither in these, nor in any allusion of this Father to any part of the New Testament, is there to be found any thing controversial respecting the birth or history of Christ. That the reader may satisfy himself as to this fact, I subjoin the several passages, to which, in addition to those above enumerated, St. Barnabas can be supposed to have referred. Matth. xxii. 43, 44. xxiv. 22. xxv. 5, 6. 10. xxvi. 31. Luke vi. 30. Acts x. 42. Rom. iv. 3. v. 16. ix. 10, 11, 12. xi. 36. xv. 8. 1 Cor. iii. 16. xi. 20. 2 Cor. v. 17. Eph. ii. 2. v. 16, 17. Phil. iv. 5. 2 Tim. i. 10. Heb. iii. 5. x. 25. 1 Pet. i. 17. ii. 5. 2 Pet. iii. 10. Rev. xxii. 12.

2. As to *St. Clement*. In the Epistle, which, as Bishop of Rome, he addressed to the Church of Corinth, we find but *four* references to the Gospel of St. Matthew; viz. vii. 1, 2, 12. ix. 42. xviii. 6. xxvi. 24. And neither in these, nor in any allusions to other parts of the New Testament, do we meet with any matter connected with the history of the birth of Christ, or relating to any object but that of moral and religious improvement, and the enforcement of Christian rules of conduct. The passages supposed to be alluded to by this father, are, in addition to those already specified, these which

follow. Luke vi. 36, 37, 38. xvii. 2. Acts xiii. 22. xx. 35. Rom. i. 29, 30. 32. ii. 20. ix. 4, 5. xiv. 1. 3. xv. 1. 1 Cor. i. 12. x. 24. xii. 12. 15. 22. 24. xiii. 4. xv. 20. 2 Cor. iii. 18. viii. 5. x. 17, 18. xi. 24, 25. Gal. i. 4. Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6. Phil. i. 10. ii. 5, 6, 7. Col. i. 10. 1 Thess. v. 18. 23. 1 Tim. ii. 8. iii. 13. v. 4. 2 Tim. i. 9. Tit. iii. 1. Heb. i. 3, 4, 5. 7. 13. iii. 2. 5. iv. 12. vi. 18. xi. 5. 7, 8. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37. 39. xii. 1, 2. 6. 9, 10, 11. James i. 5, 6, 7, 8. ii. 21. 23. iii. 13. iv. 3, 4. 6. 1 Pet. iv. 8. v. 5. 2 Pet. ii. 5, 6, 7. 9. iii. 4.

[This father's allusion to one of the above passages, Gal. i. 4, I insert here, though not connected with the present subject, as throwing a strong light upon the sense, which, in those apostolic days, was assigned to the phrase *giving himself* FOR *us*, as applied to the sacrifice of Christ. *Δια την αγαπην ην εσχεν προς ημας, το αιμα αυτου εδωκεν υπερ ημων Ιησους Χριστος ο Κυριος ημων, εν θεληματι Θεου, και την σαρκα υπερ της σαρκος ημων, και την ψυχην υπερ των ψυχων ημων.*—Patr. Apost. vol. i. pp. 189, 190.—*Through the love which he had for us, Jesus Christ our Lord, by the will of God, gave his blood for us: his flesh for our flesh, his soul for our soul.*—The reader will please to carry this exposition of the passage of Galatians, i. 4. back to p. 188—192 of vol. i. where the substitutive force of the word *υπερ*, has been already considered.]

3. In the *Shepherd of Hermas* we meet with allusions (most of them remote) to *ten* passages of St. Matthew at the most: viz. Matt. v. 28. 42. x. 32, 33. xiii. 5, 6, 7. 20, 21, 22. 31, 32. xix. 23, 24. xviii. 3, 4. xxiii. 6. xxviii. 18. The other parts of the New Testament to which this father may be supposed to allude, are the following. Mark ix. 50. Luke xiii. 24, 25. xvi. 18. John xiv. 6. Acts v. 41. Rom. viii. 11. ix. 4. xi. 29. xv. 7. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. vii. 11. 15. 2 Cor. vii. 10. Gal. iii. 27. Eph. iv. 4. 30, 31. Philip.

iv. 18. Col. i. 15, 16. 1 Thess. v. 13. 2 Tim. i. 14. iv. 18. Heb. xii. 17. James i. 5. ii. 7. iii. 15. 17. iv. 2, 3, 4, 7, 12. v. 1, 2. 4. 1 Pet. i. 6, 7. iii. 15. v. 7. 2 Pet. ii. 15. 20. 1 John ii. 27. iv. 6. v. 6. 2 John 4. 3 John 3, 4. Jude 21. 24. There are expressions also in this father resembling several in the book of Revelations. But in none of these allusions to the books of the New Testament, do we find the author concerned with any other than topics of moral and religious exhortations.

In those Epistles of Ignatius which are received as genuine, there are to be discovered, besides the allusions to the first two chapters of St. Matthew noticed at p. 215 of this volume, but *six* passages of that Evangelist to which this father can be supposed to refer: viz. iii. 15. x. 16. xii. 33. xviii. 19, 20. xix. 12. In addition to these, he may be considered as referring to the following parts of the other Gospels and of the Epistles. Luke xiv. 27. John iii. 8. viii. 29. x. 9. xii. 49. xvi. 11. 28. Acts x. 41. Rom. viii. 33, 39. xv. 7. 1 Cor. i. 10. 18, 19, 20. iv. 4. v. 7. vi. 9, 10. xv. 8. 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. Gal. i. 1. v. 4. Eph. ii. 22. iv. 3, 4, 5. v. 2. 25. 29. vi. 13, 14. 16, 17. Philip. i. 21. ii. 3. 5. Col. i. 7. 1 Thess. v. 17. 2 Tim. i. 16. 18. ii. 4. Tit. ii. 3. Philem. 20. Heb. x. 28, 29. xiii. 9. 1 Pet. v. 5. 1 John i. 2. 3 John 2. Of these, as of the passages of the New Testament alluded to by the fathers before named, it is to be remarked, that none are connected with any discussion concerning the nativity of our Lord. And the allusions, which this father (as observed at p. 215.) *has* made to that subject, will be found, upon examination, not to have been studiously and formally brought forward for the purpose of *proving* the miraculous circumstances of our Lord's birth, as if they were at that time not generally assented to: but introduced familiarly and unqualifiedly, as

relating to a fact well known, and about which no difference of opinion prevailed, or at least none that demanded a more detailed consideration.

Lastly, with respect to Polycarp, of whose writings the Epistle to the Philippians is the only one that has been preserved; his references to St. Matthew are as follow. Matt. v. 3. 7. 10. 44. vi. 12, 13, 14, 15. vii. 1, 2. xxvi. 41. These relate merely to matter of religious exhortation and enforcement, as do his remaining references to other parts of the New Testament; namely, Acts ii. 24. Rom. xii. 17. xiii. 9, 10. xiv. 10. 12. 1 Cor. v. 11. vi. 2. 9, 10. 2 Cor. iv. 14. vi. 7. viii. 21. Gal. i. 1. iv. 26. vi. 7. Ephes. ii. 8, 9. iv. 26. Philip. ii. 10, 11. 16. Col. i. 28. 1 Thess. v. 17. 22. 2 Thess. iii. 15. 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2. vi. 7. 10. 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12. iv. 10. Heb. iv. 12, 13. 1 Pet. i. 8. 13. 21. 1 Pet. ii. 11, 12. 17. 22. 24. iii. 9. 14. iv. 5. 7. v. 5. 1 John ii. 7. iv. 3. Jude 3.

The purposes, for which the Apostolical Fathers referred to the New Testament, will readily be discerned by a review of the passages, to which they can be supposed to have alluded, and which have been here very fully enumerated. In truth, so far are they from having had occasion to refer to such parts of scripture as relate to the family and birth of Christ, that, with the exception of Ignatius, their subjects in no instance lead them to any discussion or even notice of these points. The epistle of Barnabas consists of two parts: the one exhorting to constancy in the belief and profession of the Christian doctrine *without the rites of the Jewish law*: and the other containing a course of moral instructions. (See Menard. Judic. de S. Barn. Patr. Apost. vol. i. p. xxviii.) The epistle of Clement is designed to compose dissensions, which had sprung up in the church of Corinth respecting spiritual governors; and is principally occupied in recommending peace.

and harmony, and humility, and faith, and all the virtues of a Christian life. The writings of Hermas consist of visions, mandates, and similitudes, all totally unconnected with the person and history of Christ. The short letter of Polycarp, which is scarcely of sufficient bulk to fill ten octavo pages, is entirely employed in godly exhortation. And in the genuine Epistles of Ignatius, in which heretical opinions are adverted to, we find that father opposing to those opinions the fact of our Lord's miraculous birth, agreeably to the account given of it by St. Matthew; and opposing that fact as decisive and unanswerable in argument, whilst it is itself assumed as a matter about which there was no dispute. That the heretical opinions, moreover, against which he had to contend, were not those which maintained the simple humanity of Christ, but those, on the contrary, which denied his human nature altogether, and the *reality* of his suffering and resurrection; seems fairly deducible from the entire tenor and language of his Epistles, and more especially from the xith section of his Epistle to the Magnesians, in which he lays particular stress on these things having been *done truly and certainly*, *πραχθεντα αληθως και βεβαιως*.*

How little, then, upon the whole, these early fathers had to do with establishing the truth of the history relating to "the family and birth of Christ;"

* On the subject of the above paragraph, I cannot forbear recommending to the reader an excellent work of the late Mr. Wilson, of St. John's College, Cambridge, on the "Method of Explaining the New Testament by the early opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ." Let him look particularly to p. 357. and the argument connected therewith. I cannot but think, that this ingenious writer has taken a juster view than that, which even the learned Bishop Pearson, the great vindicator of Ignatius's writings, has formed, of the nature of the heresies with which this ancient father had to contend.

how little they were, in their writings, concerned in “debates with Jewish *unbelievers* ;” how little they were urged to the necessity of “referring to the two first chapters of St. Matthew,” and how little consequently Dr. Williams is at liberty to infer from the silence, which he attributes to them on the subject matter of those chapters, the conclusion that they are spurious,—I leave to the reader to determine.

That he may form the better judgment of the value of the argument derived from the silence of the Apostolical Fathers concerning any assigned portion of scripture, I shall conclude with transcribing some observations of the industrious and cautious Lardner, upon the subject of their writings. (Works, vol. ii. pp. 103, 104.)—“All these are but short pieces. The largest is the Shepherd of Hermas, which is almost as large as all the rest put together. But it was inconsistent with the nature of that work for the writer to *quote* books. All these pieces, except the Shepherd of Hermas, are *epistles* written to *Christians* ; who, it is likely, needed not at that time to be particularly informed what books they ought to receive ; but only to be admonished to attend to the things contained in them, and to maintain their respect for them, as is here often done.” From these and other particulars, he proceeds to say,—“it is apparent, that these Apostolical Fathers have not omitted to take notice of any book of the New Testament, which, as far as we are able to judge, their design led them to mention. Their silence, therefore, about any other books can be no prejudice to their genuineness, if we shall hereafter meet with credible testimonies to them.” What has been here justly remarked respecting the books of scripture, equally applies to portions of those books.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE REMARKS ON THE UNITARIAN VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In a former edition, I had been led to make some observations on the translation of the New Testament, which has been given to the public by the *Unitarians*, under the title of an IMPROVED VERSION. To the version bearing this name,—a name, which, were it not known to be the serious appellation bestowed upon it by its authors, might well be suspected as the sarcastic designation of it by its opponents,—I stated a few objections; intended rather for the purpose of presenting some specimens of the unfitness and incapacity of the Editors, and of thereby guarding the unsuspecting and unreflecting reader against the imposing pretensions of the work; than for that of exhibiting in detail the errors, corruptions, and falsifications, with which it abounds; and which, in truth, render it a production, just as much fitted to convey a correct notion of the great doctrines of Christianity, as if it had been a translation of the chapters of the Coran.*

* I find in the Brief Memorial of that excellent and learned prelate, the Bishop of St. David's, the following observations, and quotation, in which the story of Unitarian ingenuity in the management of Scripture is accurately paralleled.—“The Unitarian Version of the New Testament unites the two characters of *Marcion and Valentinus*. *Alius manu scripturas, alius sensus expositione* intervertit. Neque enim, si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur, non callidiore ingenio, quam Marcion, manus intulit veritati. Marcion enim exerte et palam machæra non stilo usus est; quoniam ad materiam suam cædem Scripturarum confecit. Valentinus autem pepercit; quoniam non ad materiam scripturas, sed ad scripturas materiam, excogitavit; et tamen plus abstulit, et plus adjecit, aufereus proprietates singulorum quoque verborum, et adjiciens dispositiones non comparentium rerum. (Tertull. De Præscript. Hæret, c. 38.)”—The Bishop adds, “Tertullian calls the Valen-

The excellent treatise of Dr. Nares, (of which I rejoice to see a second and improved edition lately published,) together with the valuable observations

tinian New Testament a *travesty*;--*fabulam in totum aliam componi*: And such is the English Unitarian Version, as any one may see who will compare it with the original." (p. 32.) In truth the joint picture of Marcion and Valentinus admirably completes the Unitarian Editor: who, at the same time, it must be confessed, has wasted strength in his performance; since he has in his nature enough of Marcion to do without Valentinus, and enough of Valentinus to make him independent of Marcion.

At the moment of finishing the above paragraph, another valuable tract of the Bishop of St. David's, just published, has fallen into my hands, in which I find a passage of Mosheim so exactly applicable to the subject, that I cannot deny myself the satisfaction of adding it to this note. That writer, contrasting the *orthodox* interpreter, with the *Socinian* of *his* day, whose moderation is the scorn of the *Unitarian* of *ours*, says, "Nos simplicitatem unice consecretamur; verba, ut usus hominum postulat, accipimus, nec aliter quam sana ratio jubet, interpretamur. Illi omnia contra: qui quidem universas ingenii vires intendunt, ut *vim dictorum sacrorum, multis variisque ambagibus, verborum contorsionibus, novis interpunctionibus, emendationibus denique, enervent, et a naturali sensu deflectant*. ITA QUI RATIONEM SEMPER NOBIS OBTRUDUNT, ID FACIUNT IPSI, QUOD RATIO FIERI POSSE NEGAT."—Disert. ad Sanct. Discip. p. 341.—See p. 72 of *The Bible and nothing but the Bible*.

To mention a single canon, of those laid down for the interpretation of Scripture by modern Unitarians, will abundantly justify the application to them of the observations of Mosheim upon their Socinian fore-runners. "Impartial and sincere inquirers after truth must be particularly upon their guard against what is called the *natural signification* of words and phrases." (*Calm Inquiry*, pp. 4, 5.) By the "*natural signification* of words," is not here understood a signification of words established by *nature*; against which, (as it is known not to exist,) no person needs to be put upon his guard; but simply, that signification, which has been sanctioned by continued usage, by the true "*jus et norma loquendi*;" in other words, that signification, which a thorough knowledge of the language attributes to the words. This is the signification of words, against which, the Unitarian, in the person of Mr. Bel-

of Dr. Laurence and Mr. Rennell, had been successfully directed to the latter object. These writers, Dr. Nares especially, had detected and exposed

sham the promulger of the above canon, would guard the reader and interpreter of scripture; and this, on the ground, that "the connexion between words and ideas is perfectly arbitrary." The misfortune of a little knowledge is, that the phrases of a science are used without a perception of their import. Locke and other Metaphysicians have said, that the connexion between words and ideas is not a *natural* but an *arbitrary* connexion. And in the sense in which they intend it, they have said truly:—namely, that, sounds being indifferent in their nature, the signification of words must be the result of an *originally arbitrary imposition*. But the connexion of words and ideas being conventional, when once established, it is so far from being *arbitrary*, that nothing is more out of the power of individuals to alter. As Locke remarks, "even the great Augustus himself, in the possession of that power which ruled the world, acknowledged he could not make a new Latin word:" that is, says he, "he could not *arbitrarily* appoint, what idea any sound should be a sign of, in the mouths and common language of his subjects." (Essay, B. 3. c. 2.)—Not so the Unitarian Metaphysicians. They have read somewhere, that "the connexion between words and ideas is arbitrary;" and mistaking the true meaning of the position, they are enabled by their ignorance, to accomplish what Augustus could not by his power, to give arbitrarily to words whatever signification they may choose.

Mr. Belsham very properly follows up this canon by another, which pronounces, that learning is by no means a necessary requisite for the just comprehension of scripture—but that "a sound understanding and an honest mind" are fully sufficient for the purpose. The critical knowledge of a language can undoubtedly be of little use, where words have no established meaning. And the Editors of the Unitarian New Testament, have accordingly acted with perfect consistency, in paying (as they openly avow) but little attention to "verbal criticism" in the execution of their translation. In fact, the grossest ignorance (and especially of the original language of the N. T.) is displayed by them and their assistant Commentators in every page of their compilations. This, indeed, seems at all times to have been a distinguishing characteristic of the Socinian School. The learned Elsner speaks of that Sect in the following language, which is surely not unappropriate to its followers of the present day. "Ad confutandos adversarios, et pestilentissimæ præser-

many of the principal and most pernicious of the fallacies and blunders of this *Improved Version*. Some of the periodical journals also, more particularly the *Quarterly* and *Eclectic Reviews*, had contributed their aid to the same salutary purpose. It, therefore, became the less necessary for me, to carry my animadversions beyond the extent and the object, to which I had proposed to confine myself.

The Glasgow Religious Tract Society, whose exertions in the dissemination of religious knowledge are highly meritorious, finding that uncommon efforts were making to spread Unitarian principles in Glasgow and its vicinity, and conceiving that the circulation of the *Remarks on the Unitarian*

tim Socinianorum Sectæ dogmata convellenda, præsentissimum auxilium fert Græcæ linguæ peritia. Summum horum hominum artificium in eo consistit, ut novas et insolentes notiones, quasque situs verborum plane respuit, vocibus subjiciant, loquutiones violenter divellant, omniaque misceant et turbent, ut aliquam saltem hæresi suæ veri speciem ex sacris libris inducant, Græcæ enim linguæ fere expertes sunt.—Sane ut *novam religionem* excogitarunt hi homines, cui postea accommodare sacros libros sunt conati, sic et *nova lingua* opus habent, qua omnes opinionis suæ errores eant confirmatum.” *Observ. Sac. præf. ad Lect.* It is with good reason that Mr. Belsham exclaims against a critical attention to the “*niceties*” of the Greek language, and against what he denominates “*grammatical subtilties* :”—this seems also not unseasonably introduced in the Introduction to his *Calm Inquiry*. Indeed this writer seems disposed to carry his ideas of the inutility of the knowledge of the Greek language for a just translation of the Greek Testament, somewhat beyond the “*niceties*” and “*grammatical subtilties*” of the language: for he asks in triumph, “Who ever heard of a juryman being challenged, because he was not a *good grammarian*? Can no one know that Gustavus is banished from his throne, who is not able to read the instrument of his deposition in the *original language*.” (p. 6.)—After this, will any one pretend to say, that for a perfect knowledge of the contents of the Old and New Testament, an acquaintance with the Hebrew and Greek languages, or a knowledge of the grammar of *any* language, is in any degree necessary?

Version in a detached form, might assist in counteracting the threatened evil, applied in the year 1813 for my permission to publish them separately as an extract from the work. To this I willingly assented: and that Society accordingly printed and circulated a large edition of the Extract, under the title of *An Exposure of the unwarrantable liberties taken by the Unitarians with the sacred scriptures in their Version of the New Testament*. No sooner did this short tract make its appearance, than it was determined to assail it without mercy. It presented itself in a size and compass adapted to the Theologians of Hackney: and, as without much demand for literature, or much expenditure of thought, a pamphlet of about the same dimensions could be easily thrown off, in their usual popular stile of dashing declamation and confident assertion; with a shew of learning and logic sufficient to disguise gross ignorance and rank sophistry; a mixture of pleasantry and sarcasm suited to the taste of those likely to become its readers; and, above all, with the note of triumph so uniformly and so ludicrously sounded by the modern writers of the Unitarian school, on every repetition of arguments which have been a thousand times refuted, and are yet as often advanced without the slightest notice of previous refutation:—such a thing was manufactured and sent abroad, for the total discomfiture of the author of the work on Atonement and Sacrifice, and consequently for the entire subversion of the doctrines which that work maintains. The pamphlet itself I did not consider entitled to notice. But as its anonymous author, under the assumed appellation of the CALM INQUIRER,* has charged me with unfair

* The writer, although he entitles himself a “CALM INQUIRER,” it should be observed, does not thereby *mean to announce* himself as the author of the “CALM INQUIRY.” And yet it seems

treatment of the editors of the Unitarian Version, now that the sending out the present edition brings me again upon the subject, I shall not scruple to reconsider the objections which I have already advanced against that Version; and at the same time to bestow a few observations upon the vindication of the Version, which has been attempted by this *Calm Inquirer* in answer to those objections. This

somewhat whimsical, that Mr. Belsham, in his Letters to the Rev. H. Horsley, denominates the author of the "CALM INQUIRY" continually by the title of the "CALM INQUIRER:" (Month. Rep. vol. viii. pp. 387, 452, 724, 725.) and this in the pages of the very volume in which the "ADDRESS" of the "CALM INQUIRER" is inserted.

The two things, however, are reconcilable. A person entitling himself a *Calm Inquirer*, may yet not be the author of a *Calm Inquiry*: but he who has been the author of a *Calm Inquiry*, cannot be other than a *Calm Inquirer*.—Dr. Nares, in the new edition of his *Remarks*, (p. 248.) speaks, from what authority I know not, of the author of this pamphlet being "said to be Mr. Belsham himself, the principal Editor of the Improved Version." Mr. Wardlaw of Glasgow, also pronounces the "*Calm Inquirer* as generally understood to be Mr. Belsham:" and assigns as the ground of his own belief that it is so, the prevalence of the report, and likewise certain characters of internal evidence, arising from the calmness, the modesty, and the suavity, which he represents as markedly indicative of the style and manner of that writer. (Discourses on the principal points of the Socinian Controversy, p. 431.)—Whether the conjectures of Dr. Nares and Mr. Wardlaw be well founded, I know not. I should have supposed Mr. Belsham to be possessed of more manliness than to *skulk* from an opponent; and whatever be the errors, absurdities, and vulgarities of this little pamphlet conjecturally ascribed to him; be the deficiencies in reasoning, in knowledge, and in taste, what they may; I am satisfied from *convincing proofs*, that the author of the Review of Mr. Wilberforce, the Letters on Arianism, the *Calm Inquiry*, and the Letters to the Rev. H. Horsley, has the *courage* to avow them all, if the production be truly his. Thus acquitted then of all connexion with this miserable little performance, as Mr. Belsham must *feel* himself to be, he of course will not be affected by any observations, that may be occasionally bestowed upon it, in the course of the ensuing remarks.

I am the more readily disposed to do, because (as far as I know) this pamphlet contains the only defence of the Version that has been offered to the public in a detached form; and because the body of English Unitarians have attributed to it (trifling as it is) so high a value, that not content with printing and circulating it at the expense of their public fund, they have superadded the publication of it in their Magazine, thus securing to it every degree of currency and credit, that it is in the power of the entire body to bestow. Recognised and adopted in this manner by the whole community of Unitarians, (who appear now to be consolidated and organized in a manner somewhat approaching the system of the Wesleyan Methodists,) it is of course to be viewed as their own authenticated and deliberate defence of their version; at least so far as the objections advanced in a late edition of this work are concerned. We are therefore in no danger of mistaking the sense in which the Unitarian editors wish to be understood upon the points at issue: and with the lights and explanations now afforded, we can be at no loss, in the revision of our former arguments, to know how far they apply to what, on the fullest consideration, the Unitarians themselves admit to be their meaning.

The charges advanced by me in a former edition, were prefaced by one or two observations on the disingenuousness of the Editors of the new Version, in their use of the name of Archbishop Newcome: professing to ground their Version upon the basis of his translation, whilst in truth they adopted no part of it that interfered with their peculiar opinions: and thereby securing a respectable name for their Unitarian blasphemies, and contriving to circulate their poisons under a false label. Both the language and the matter of this charge have given

great offence. I cannot depart from either. As to the former, deeming the opinions held by modern Unitarians to be *blasphemous* and *pestilential*,* I cannot in truth and justice denominate them by any other terms; and as to the latter; being satisfied, that the charge of *deception* and *falsehood* in the *pretended* adherence to the Archbishop's translation, is founded in fact, I hold myself bound to make it good; and shall, for this purpose, more particularly bring before the reader's view the language and the conduct of the Editors in reference to this subject.

They inform us, (Introd. p. iv.) that they had adopted Archbishop Newcome's translation as the basis of their own, "not only because of its general accuracy, simplicity, and fidelity; but principally because he professes to have followed the text of Griesbach's edition," on the accuracy of which they largely descant. They state also, that "they assumed it as a principle, that no alteration should be made in the Primate's translation but where it appeared to be *necessary* to the correction of error or inaccuracy, in the text, the language, the construction, or the sense." The *Calm* defender of the Editors adds, that they "could not without the most flagrant violation of honour and honesty have published their work without the most open and explicit acknowledgment of the use which they had thus made

* Perhaps indeed the term "*blasphemy*," which has been that adopted by the Laws of the Land in speaking of the Socinian or Unitarian tenets, it may be thought by the Unitarians, no person has now a right to employ; as the *Laws against blasphemy* have been lately repealed by the Legislature. On the subject of this Repeal, the BRIEF MEMORIAL of the Bishop of St. David's, that watchful, and able, and learned guardian of the interests of true religion and of the Established Church, deserves the most serious consideration from all to whom these interests are dear.

of the translation of the learned Primate." (Address, &c. p. 6.) But if "honour and honesty" demanded *so* "open an acknowledgment of the use which they had made of the Primate's translation," was there not some little matter of "honour and honesty" concerned likewise in making *as* open an acknowledgment of the use they *did not* make of that translation? Was it from a principle of justice to the Primate, that they first announced his translation as a model, and then departed from it whenever it suited their convenience: that they abide by the Primate just so long as he abides by them; following him in all matters that are perfectly indifferent, but utterly disregarding him in all those in which their peculiar opinions are concerned; until at length, even by the confession of their Vindicator himself, nearly *one tenth** of this new Version is

* Address by a Calm Inquirer, &c. p. 6. "More than nine-tenths of the Improved Version is the Primate's own."—What this writer exactly means by these words, it is not very easy to understand. Whether it be, that *nine-tenths* of the *words taken numerically* are the same; or that *nine-tenths* of the *sentences* agree, I am at a loss to determine. In the first case, since the distinct sentences of the N. T. contain, one with another, more than ten words each, it is manifest, that by a proper distribution of the differing words, the two translations might possibly disagree in every sentence; and so become repugnant in their sense throughout. In the second, it is allowed, that in one sentence in every ten, the two versions may be at variance, and consequently that they may differ in *every* passage affecting the *doctrines* of Christianity; since these would clearly not extend to the tenth part of the N. T. estimated by its component sentences. How absurd, then, and fallacious is it, under either acceptation of the words, to pretend to speak of the Primate's Version as *any* basis or standard whatsoever!—It must be observed too, that the admission of this great extent of departure from the pretended model was not made, until, after a laborious research for the very purpose of the discovery, it had been shown to the public, that nearly one thousand variations from the text of the Primate have taken place. On this point I refer

found to differ from that which it professes to follow? So that a translation, which they adopted as their basis, from "its general *accuracy, simplicity and fidelity*," and from its adherence to the *correct text of Griesbach*, they find it "*necessary*" to depart from, by their own confession, to the amount of the ONE TENTH, on account of what they deem "*error or inaccuracy, in the text, the language, the construction, or the sense.*" And this they call making one translation the *basis* of the other: and this entitles them, nay compels them under the imperious demand of "honour and honesty," to spread the name of ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME* in large characters over the title

the reader to Dr. Nares's Remarks, (2d edit. p. 3.) where it is stated, that even by a Unitarian Reviewer there had been reckoned up 750 deviations from Newcome, *in addition* to those "from the received text, and from Griesbach's second edition (not duly noticed or pointed out to the reader as they ought to be:)" and that the same Unitarian writer *regrets*, "that *no* standard text had been adhered to, 'because' (says he) '*it would do away one of the most powerful charges brought against us, namely, THAT WE ALTER THE SCRIPTURES TO SUIT OUR OWN SYSTEM.*'"

* Dr. Nares very justly observes, that whilst Archbishop Newcome's name is held out as a model in the title page, the Editors expressly inform us, (in a note, however, not quite so prominent as the title page,) that nothing but the clear and discriminating light diffused over the obscurities of the sacred scriptures by the venerable Theophilus Lindsey, and his coadjutors, Jebb, Priestley, Wakefield, and others, could *purify the Christian Religion from those numerous and enormous corruptions, which have so long disfigured its doctrines, and impaired its progress.* "This," he adds, "is speaking out plainly, though it rather surprises me, that none of these names appear in the title page to recommend the book, while *two* Archbishops are selected for this purpose; for besides the learned *Primate* of Ireland, a motto is adopted from *Archbishop Parker's* preface to the *Bishop's Bible*, by way surely of a second decoy to the unwary members of the Church." (Remarks, &c. p. 2.)—The Calm Inquirer indeed observes, (p. 6.) that "the Editors of the Improved Version are not idolaters of Archbishops as such:" and from

page of their book ; and to impress the reader with the belief, that he is, in substance at least, perusing the *Primate's New Testament*, when he is perusing one purposely contrived to empty it of every doctrine which the *Primate* deemed essential to Christianity.

Well, but then we are told, that "*wherever they have judged it expedient to deviate from the Primate's translation, the Editors have, with the most scrupulous fidelity, given notice of the change, and set down the Primate's words in the margin.*" So the *Calm Inquirer* positively asserts. (p. 6.) The Editors also state the same for themselves ; and affirm that not only where they have deviated from the *Primate's Version*, but also where they have deviated from the *Received Text*, they have, "in every instance," noticed the alteration at the foot

this he would have it inferred, that the charge of the intention of "sheltering themselves under the name of *Primate Newcome*" is totally unfounded. But this gentleman will please to recollect, that it was not to any extraordinary reverence for *Archbishops*, but to the gainful use which might be made of their authority, that their fondness for the name of *Primate Newcome* had been ascribed. It had been said, and with how much truth, he who examines the work carefully, may judge for himself, that the assumption of the name of a respected prelate of the Church of England for the sanction of a work, in which every doctrine professed by that Church, and by that respected member of it, is directly attacked, is something more than an artifice ; that it is a falsehood and a fraud, and can have no other object than that of procuring a circulation by drawing in unsuspecting purchasers.—But to return to the title page :—there we find in large characters, IMPROVED VERSION, ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S TRANSLATION, CORRECTED TEXT.—Archbishop Parker, and the Bishops' Bible are also made to meet the eye :—and all is executed by a SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.—The advocates of Materialism and Necessity were too strongly impressed with the power of association, not to have been aware of the great value of a good *prima facie* adjustment.

of the page. (Introd. p. iv.) Now, although this by no means clears the Editors from imputation, for the reasons already alleged, yet upon this point I readily join issue with both them and their Vindicator. The *reverse* of the affirmation so peremptorily made by both, is notoriously the fact; and a fact which presents itself in such a form, that, although the compilers of this new version are entitled to take credit for much of precipitancy and carelessness on many points, yet they cannot be allowed to claim the unqualified benefit of that excuse upon this. Of the numerous examples, which might be cited in support of the assertion here made, I shall adduce a few, which will abundantly suffice to shew what degree of reliance is to be placed on the accuracy of these Unitarian Editors: and which, as vitally affecting some of the great doctrines of Christianity, will clearly manifest, how far "honour and honesty" have been followed, in "making open acknowledgment" of *every departure* from the Version professed to be held in constant view.

I. Luke i. 35.—*Newcome*—"therefore that holy child also who shall be born of thee, shall be called THE Son of God."—*Imp. Vers.*—"therefore that holy child also who shall be born of thee shall be called A Son of God."

II. John i. 12.—*N.*—"But as many as received him, to them he gave POWER TO BECOME children of God."—*I. V.*—"But as many as received him, to them he gave AUTHORITY TO BE THE children of God."

III. John iii. 13.—*N.*—"Now no man GOETH up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man, who WAS in heaven."—*I. V.*—"Now no man HATH ASCENDED up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man, [who IS in heaven.]"

IV. Rom. ix. 5.—*N.*—"Whose are the fathers,

and of whom, AS CONCERNING THE FLESH, Christ *came*, WHO IS OVER ALL, GOD BLESSED forever, AMEN.”—*I. V.*—“Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom, BY NATURAL DESCENT, Christ *came*. GOD, WHO IS OVER ALL, BE BLESSED for ever.”

V. 2 Cor. viii. 9.—*N.*—“For ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, that THOUGH he was rich, yet for your sakes he BECAME POOR, that through his poverty ye might be rich.”—*I. V.*—“For ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, that WHILE he was rich, yet for your sakes he LIVED IN POVERTY, that through his poverty ye might be rich.”

VI. Hebr. xii. 25, 26.—*N.*—“See that ye refuse not HIM who speaketh. For if those escaped not who refused him THAT uttered THE ORACLES OF GOD on earth, much MORE we *shall* NOT *escape*, if we reject him WHO WAS from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised,” &c.—*I. V.*—“See that ye refuse not GOD who speaketh. For if those escaped not who refused him WHEN HE uttered ORACLES on earth, much LESS *shall* we *escape*, if we reject him SPEAKING from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised,” &c.

Now, are these specimens, which are but a very few out of the number that might be adduced of *important, unacknowledged*, departures from Newcome’s Version, to be accounted for from mere *accident*? If so, undoubtedly, the Editors, in this their heedless innocence, have been wonderfully fortunate in stumbling so opportunely on passages, in which the omission of *acknowledgment* turns out so peculiarly favourable to their predominant opinions: and on all of which, (excepting the first, which they are desirous to explode altogether as spurious,) they employ lengthened observations in the notes.

for the very purpose of divesting them of all appearance of the meaning, which would necessarily result from the Primate's rendering, deliberately and *unacknowledgedly* rejected and altered by them.

Respecting the *first* of these texts, it is obvious to remark, that the difference between the two forms of expression, "THE Son of God," and "A Son of God," affects immediately the question respecting the nature of our Lord's sonship: the great object with the Unitarians being to represent it in such a light as would admit human beings to be described as standing in the like relation to God. "All Christians," Mr. Belsham tells us in his *Calm Inquiry*, (p. 262.) "are children of God, being the heirs and expectants of a resurrection to a happy and immortal life." The Editors also take care to inform us, in their note on Rom. i. 4, that "Christ is called the Son of God for two reasons: first, because this title is equivalent to that of Messiah, and was so understood by the Jews, John i. 50:" and "secondly, he is called* a Son of God as having been

* There is something strikingly characteristic of Unitarian critics in this note on Rom. i. 4. They tell us, that "Christ is called THE 'Son of God' for two reasons:" and the *second of the two* explains to us why "he is called A Son of God."—Now, is it really, that these critics *so far* disregard "verbal criticism," as to reject all difference between the *definite* and *indefinite* forms; or are they willing so to confound them occasionally in ordinary use, as to prepare an excuse for a similar confusion where it may stand them in good stead; or do they mean, that in the first of the two senses, our Lord is to be called THE 'Son of God,' and in the second A 'Son of God?'—But, in truth, to look after the *meaning* of such Critics is in most cases an idle pursuit. To exhibit their *want of meaning*, may not indeed be an equally unprofitable occupation. And therefore I must detain the reader for a short while, in tracing out the consistency with which these translators execute their office in the application of the *definite and indefinite* forms; especially so far as the important designation of our Lord, above alluded to, is concerned.

In John xix. 7, they tell us, that the reason assigned by the

raised from the dead to an immortal life; that "in this sense Christ is called the first born, having been the first human being who was put into possession

Jews for demanding our Lord's execution, was, "because he made himself *A Son of God*." And when in Luke xxii. 70, they give us our Lord's own confession, on which the Jews are said to ground this accusation, it is, that he made himself "*THE Son of God*." So that, having been guilty of the crime of calling himself "*THE Son of God*," he is condemned because he called himself "*A Son of God*."—But, yet farther, they represent the Jews as putting our Lord to death, because he confessed himself to be "*A Son of God*;" that is, because he confessed himself to be *one* of that description of persons represented under the general appellation of "*Sons of God*;" one of those, who were "heirs and expectants of a resurrection to a happy immortality," as the author of the *Calm Inquiry*, (p. 262) and the Editors, in the note on Rom. i. 4. explain the appellation. Now, will the Editors, and their *Calm Inquirer*, be good enough to point out what "*blasphemy*" there was in this declaration; or what was the law of the Jewish Code, by which our Lord was doomed to die for this sad transgression of professing himself *one of those* who were *believers in and expectants of* a happy immortality?—Oh, no, they answer, it is not in *this* sense of the expression, but in that which makes it equivalent with *Messiah*, (which they are pleased at another time to tell us is all that the phrase *Son of God* implies,) that condemnation is passed upon our Lord. Well then, our Lord, in declaring that he was "*A SON OF GOD*," declared that he was *A MESSIAH*: and it was for this that he suffered. We must here again apply to the Editors, and to the *Calm Inquirer* who defends them, to inform us *how many Messiahs* there were to be; or whether, if but one *Messiah* be spoken of in Scripture, "*A Son of God*," as such, and therefore *each* of those *Sons of God* whom the Editors and the *Calm Inquirer* have described to us, was to be that *one Messiah*. If the latter be the meaning of these theologians, (as, from their never having, in their various learned publications, intimated any thing of a *plurality of Messiahs*, it may not be deemed too unreasonable to conjecture,) then, the only cause, why they have hitherto objected to the *UNITY* of the Athanasian Creed, *must be*, that the persons of the *Monad* have not been sufficiently multiplied for their taste. I beg pardon of my reader. It is scarcely possible to treat of the arguments of some writers, without being forced to trifle.—But we may now see in one plain instance, the degree of improvement, which this *Improv-*

of this glorious inheritance;" that "all believers as heirs of the same inheritance, are also Sons of God:" and that "these are the only senses in which the

ed Version has attained: the translation first differing with itself, as we have pointed out in the former of these observations; and next differing more fatally with the meaning which it is intended to convey, as we have shewn in the latter.

But no: it was the great accuracy of the Translators. They were careful to abide by the *Corrected Greek Text of Griesbach*, with which they are so delighted. And as the Greek article occurs in one place, and not in the other, of those to which we have referred, they have translated in the *definite* and the *indefinite* form accordingly. No, in truth, they abide by no such rule, nor by any rule whatever. They have, on the contrary, in the use of the *definite* and *indefinite* forms, taken such liberties, (just as they do with Griesbach's text generally as well as Newcome's,) as suited their convenience; rendering the *article* noun frequently in the *indefinite* form, and as frequently giving the *definite* form to the *anarthrous*. Had they indeed adopted such a rule as is above alluded to, they would have adopted a wrong one; because, as has been well shewn by those who understand the subject, the Greek article is not in every case necessarily to be rendered by the English definite, much less is the English indefinite to be always employed where the Greek article is wanting. The researches of the learned render it totally unnecessary to enter into this subject; and it may perhaps suffice to refer to the first two sentences of the book of Genesis, to shew what effect the unqualified application of the above rule to the Septuagint Greek would produce on our English translation: for Θεος having the article prefixed in the first sentence, and the words πνευμα Θεο being each destitute of the article in the second, we must then render thus, "In the beginning THE God created the heaven and the earth"—"and a spirit of A God moved upon the face of the waters." In nothing is the difference between the *School-boy* and the *Scholar* more remarkable, than in the qualification of general rules. To which class the Editors and their brother critics belong, whoever takes the pains of examining their criticisms will be at no loss to discover.

I have however already said, that they are not to be charged with an *adherence* to the rule alluded to. No; they at the same time admit the rule and violate it without cause. They follow no system either in the conformity or the departure: but every where, according as it answers their purpose, or even as it hits

title, Son of God, is applied to Christ in the genuine apostolical writings.”—Now, it is quite clear, that in the passage of which we at present treat, the

their fancy, they apply or reject it altogether at pleasure. That I do not state this too strongly, one or two instances may suffice to prove. In Luke iv. 9. the words of the devil addressed to our Lord, *εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, they translate, “If thou be A Son of God;” whilst the *very same* words, used by the *very same* being, and under *all* the circumstances *precisely the same*, they translate, when they occur in Matthew iv. 36; and even again in the same Evangelist Luke, (iv. 3.) “If thou be THE Son of God.” [And as if they were determined to be in *nothing* correct, in what they call a *corrected text*, they even make a distinction between these latter passages, printing the article in the last one as *belonging* to the Greek text, and in the two others as *not* belonging to it, but introduced by the Translator.—What makes it more extraordinary, also, that they should have selected the indefinite form for the passage in Luke iv. 9, is, that in that passage, the *article* is found in the Greek text in a vast variety of MSS; insomuch that it has hitherto formed a part of the received text, and it is doubtful, whether notwithstanding Griesbach’s rejection, it should not do so still.]—Again, the same form of expression, with a difference affecting merely the tense and person of the verb, *αληθὺς Θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ*, *αληθὺς Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν*, occurring also in one and the same Evangelist, (Matth. xiv. 33, and xxvii. 54) they translate differently, although in both departing from the received translation: in the former, “Truly thou art A Son of God; and in the latter, “Truly this was A Son of A God.”—[They imagined undoubtedly, that they were making the expression *heathenish enough* for the Centurion in this last passage. But had they been a little better acquainted with the writings of the Classics, they would have known, that although *a God* was a familiar phrase with the ancients, *a Son of a God* was a title to which they were perfect strangers: and that, consequently, the expression being borrowed from the Jews, must have been applied in like manner as *they* applied it, and as they had just before applied it in the hearing of the Centurion, (see verse 40, where the Editors themselves translate “THE Son of God,” although there is no article in the Greek:) or, to speak more correctly, the Centurion being convinced (by what he had beheld) of the truth of our Lord’s assertions, declared his belief in that truth, by ascribing to him the title which he had claimed with his dying breath, and for claiming which he had been sentenced to die;

title is applied in a sense very different from either of these. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow

and consequently used the phrase in the sense in which our Lord himself applied it, whatever sense that might be—"Truly this man must have been that which he called himself, THE SON OF GOD."—Besides, it still remains to be asked, what reason is there to presume, that the Centurion, who had been a resident in Judea, was not a devout man, and one who had been taught to look for the kingdom of the Messiah.] In the last two instances, we have had, under the very same form of Greek expression, the varieties of "A Son of God, and "A Son of A God." But we have still another mode of rendering, not only the same form of expression, but as applied in exactly the same circumstances with the latter of these two instances, namely as uttered by the Centurion, who in the parallel passage of St. Mark (xv. 39) is made to exclaim, "Truly this was THE SON OF A GOD." Here now it must be admitted, is sufficient variety. The *same* Greek words, uttered by persons similarly conditioned, and under circumstances, in one pair of instances exactly alike, and in another sufficiently so, are rendered by the Editors in three different ways, (in compliment partly to Wakefield, partly to Campbell, and partly to themselves,) "A Son of God,"—"A Son of A God,"—and "THE SON OF A GOD;"—in short, in almost every way excepting that one in which they *should* have been rendered, in compliment to *truth*.

I have dwelt too long upon the whimsical varieties, in which the Editors indulge in reference to the use of the article. But there is one application of their versatile canon, which I cannot but particularly notice. The words *μετα κρισεως* occur without an article in six passages of the Greek Testament: in Matth. x. 15. xi. 22. 24. xii. 36. 2 Pet. ii. 9. iii. 7: the word *μετα* being in the dative case in some, and in the accusative in others. These words the Editors have thought it right (disregarding their favourite model, *Newcome*,) to render in the indefinite form, "A day of judgment," in the first four passages; and in the definite form, "THE day of judgment," in the other two. What they mean by thus multiplying *days of judgment*, it is for them to explain. The *Remedial* system, perhaps, as (we have seen at pp. 141. 146—148 of this volume,) Mr. Belsham chooses to call it; or the system of *purgatory*, by which name it is more generally understood, may tend to throw some light upon this matter; because the lengthened process which that system demands, according to the shewing of its advocates, must, in its

thee : THEREFORE" (not, observe, because he was the "Messiah," nor because of his being "raised from the dead to an immortal life," but simply *because of*

various stages, demand various adjustments of the degrees of suffering, according to the degree to which the purgation has from time to time proceeded : and these may possibly by the Unitarian supporters of this doctrine be viewed as so many different sentences passed upon the moral agent, who is the subject of this purgative process ; and the respective dates of these be consequently considered as so many different days of sentence or judgment. "THE *day of judgment*," as they are pleased to admit it to be in the 2d Epistle of St. Peter, they may perhaps be able to explain, as some one of these days more distinguished than the rest, and therefore so denominated *ἡμέρα κρίσεως* : or possibly, they may altogether disregard the emphasis given to it here, and also in 1 John iv. 17, (where alone the article is prefixed to the word *ἡμέρα*,) from the general contempt in which they hold the Epistles ; the writers of which they have so often shewn to be ignorant and uninformed. I know not, whether, upon the whole, I have explained the matter entirely in the way, that the Editors and their coadjutors will approve. But this I cannot but think very extraordinary, that those who will not allow in strictness the conceivable existence of either *day of Judgment*, or *Son of God*, yet insist at some times upon multiplying both without limit.

The Editors and their associates complain, that orthodox writers are too prone to lay a stress upon the use of the article ; and that their endeavours to build Christian doctrines on so slight a foundation is quite absurd : and on this account they are not sparing in their raillery against Mr. Granville Sharp, Dr. Wordsworth, the Bishop of St. David's, and Dr. (now Bishop) Middleton. It appears, however, that these gentlemen, although they do not trouble themselves much in seeking after any very *critical* use of the article, yet contrive to make a very *convenient* use of it : and *they*, at least, are not backward, in building doctrines of the last moment upon the application of an *a*, or a *the*. How they contrive to *overturn* important doctrines by the dexterous management of these minute parts of speech, we have already seen. I shall now give a specimen of their mode of employing them to establish the tenets of their own system. Dr. Carpenter, one of their latest and most prominent writers, supplies us with a good instance to this purpose. He observes, upon John v. 27, that the article, which in every other part of the Gospels, where the phrase "*Son of Man*" oc-

the mode of his human generation by the power of God; because of his being incarnate by the Holy Ghost; because, in short, in the plain sense of the

curs, is prefixed to it in the Greek, is here wanting: and *therefore* he renders the words, "A Son of Man:" and says, that he is satisfied, that by the remarkable words *οτι υιος ανθρωπου εστι*, our Lord is to be understood as declaring, that he *was appointed to his high office of Judge of all mankind*, BECAUSE HE IS A PROPER HUMAN BEING," (Unit. the Doct. &c. p. 109.) Now, certainly, that a person should be appointed to judge the whole world at the last day, simply, *because* that person was a human being, a human being properly and strictly such, seems as curious in point of reason, as that *υιος ανθρωπου* must signify a mere man *because* the article is not prefixed, appears in point of grammar. What upon the whole does Dr. Carpenter acquaint us with here? He opens up two important truths:—one, that because our Lord in this place denominates himself *υιος ανθρωπου*, and not *ο υιος του ανθρωπου*, (which, by the way, he *every where else* calls himself, in not fewer than 70 passages throughout the Gospels,) he must be merely and simply *man* in the common sense of the word: the other, that, from being simply man, he is properly qualified for the office of Judging all mankind:—and indeed this peculiar fitness of a mere man for this office is viewed by this writer, as an additional confirmation of his belief in the proper humanity of Christ.

Mr. Belsham, who likewise contends, that this text in John "implies that there is a peculiar propriety in delegating this office to a human being," (Calm Inquiry, p. 337,) yet seems in some degree to stumble at it; although from the manner in which he recovers himself, it may appear, as if he only wished to shew with what a grace he could regain his upright position. For after enumerating above twenty passages of the N. T. from which he admits it to be "concluded, that Jesus is appointed to appear in person to raise the dead, to judge the world, and to award to every individual of the human race his final sentence of reward or punishment; he proceeds to say, "this is an office of such transcendant dignity and importance, and requires powers so far superior to any thing which we can conceive to belong to a mere human being, however meritorious and exalted, that to many it appears utterly incredible, that such an office should be assigned to one who was himself at one time a PECCABLE AND FALLIBLE MAN, and as such, LIABLE TO APPEAR AT THE TRIBUNAL OF ETERNAL JUSTICE." And he adds, "that "this argument has appeared so forcible to some persons of much

words, *God was his Father* ; THEREFORE) “that Holy Child also which shall be born of thee shall be called THE SON OF GOD.”

learning and reflection, that *this consideration alone* has prevented them from acceding to the Unitarian hypothesis, though they have acknowledged that *particular texts might admit of a satisfactory explanation upon Unitarian principles.*” Among these persons he specially notices “the late revered and learned Hugh Farmer, of Walthamstow, *who thought that difficulties from particular texts MIGHT be overcome,*” and who had, to the great delight of Mr. Belsham, gone so far as to consider “Tertullian’s testimonies to the Unitarianism of the primitive Christians” un rebutted; yet even he, and others who had travelled, it seems, very far with Unitarians, and were disposed to get rid of the difficulties which Scripture threw in their way, could never get rid of this. Mr. Belsham himself, admits it to be “a great difficulty” indeed: but he adduces some considerations, by which he says, “it may possibly be ALLEVIATED.” The word “*alleviated*” naturally suggests the idea of great distress, under which it cannot be denied Mr. Belsham appears to labour not a little upon this point. However, after quoting a passage from Dr. Priestley, in which that writer endeavours to convince Dr. Price of this grand Unitarian tenet, by telling him that the power to judge the world might be *as easily* imparted by God, *as the power of raising the dead*, (which very power, by the way, Dr. Price had, in a Sermon on the Pre-existence and Dignity of Christ, that completely overwhelms with confutation the Socinian hypothesis of our Lord’s humanity, pronounced to be fully equivalent to the *power of creating a world*—Sermons, p. 148,) and by reminding him that our Lord’s qualifications for discharging this office were not acquired *suddenly*, for that a long interval was to take place, “between his ascension and his second coming, in which it cannot be supposed that he is *doing and learning nothing* :”—Mr. Belsham, I say, after quoting this passage from Dr. Priestley, and making some other equally profound observations of his own, concludes at length, in triumph, that the point is completely made out, that Christ is but “*figuratively a judge*, because the final states of all mankind will be awarded in a future life agreeably to the solemn, repeated, and explicit declarations of his Gospel.” Thus we find all, *as usual*, settled in *figure*. And to shew how just this is here, Mr. Belsham reminds us, that the Unitarians have already established the fact, that the several capacities and offices ascribed to our Lord in Scripture, belonged to him *only in figure*: that he is

In verse 32 also, just preceding, we find Newcome use the definite article, "He shall be great, and shall be called THE Son of the Most High." And in

but FIGURATIVELY a *Lawgiver*; but FIGURATIVELY a *Priest*; but FIGURATIVELY a *King*; and in like manner but FIGURATIVELY a *Judge*:—that is, that being in fact, *neither* LAWGIVER, *nor* PRIEST, *nor* KING, *nor* JUDGE, he is called in Scripture by all these names, and described as doing the acts belonging to these several offices, merely from the love which the Sacred Writers have of speaking *in figure*, even at the risk of misleading almost the whole Christian world as to the reality.

I beg the reader's attention to all that Mr. Belsham has *revealed* to us upon this subject, in his *Calm Inquiry*, from p. 332 to p. 342. And yet one great puzzle remains; for it will be remembered that this same CALM INQUIRER tells us, in the outset of his work, at page 5, that the whole Inquiry concerning the person of Christ, "is into a *plain matter of fact*, which is to be determined like any other fact by its specific evidence, the evidence of PLAIN UNEQUIVOCAL *testimony*,"—(here are no "great difficulties" that require to be "*alleviated*")—"for judging of which, no other qualifications are requisite than a sound understanding and an honest mind." The great difficulty, however, that appears to grow out of this seeming contradiction, will be easily "*alleviated*" by Mr. Belsham's assuring us, that a "*plain matter of fact*," must mean a *puzzling matter of figure*; and that the "*plain unequivocal testimony*" of the Evangelists consisted in their *figurative and intricate involutions* of language, which none but Unitarians could develop, and which even they were not able to develop to some of their own *enlightened friends*, such as Dr. Price and Mr. Farmer, who were desirous of approaching them if they could.—And, as a proof of the great *plainness* of this whole matter, this extraordinary writer, who assigns *any thing* as a reason for *any thing*, goes on to say, "who can believe that the decision of the great question, whether Jesus of Nazareth is the true God, and the Creator and Governor of the world, depends upon a critical knowledge of the niceties of the Greek article?"—Nobody, most undoubtedly, ever believed or even dreamed any such thing. At the same time, if real and profound Greek Scholars have found the designative and emphatical force of the Greek article fall in with the great truth, which stands like a rock of demonstration on the base of the whole body of the Scriptures, how can the thing be helped? It cannot indeed but move contempt to see those, who are not conversant in the Greek language, employing their very ignorance

this likewise the *followers* of Newcome *desert* him, rendering "A Son of the Most High," and giving no notice whatever of the departure. This, however,

for the subversion of that great truth; and endeavouring to derive from an uncritical and unscholarlike application of the Greek article, an argument, whereby the great Creator and Governor of the world, *the Son of God* who had been with his Father before all worlds, and who condescended to come into the world as *the Son of Man* that he might redeem and judge the world,—should be degraded to the rank of mere man, fallible and peccable as any of those unhappy blasphemers of his Majesty, who dare to pronounce him such. For a full and satisfactory explanation of the force of the phrase *Son of Man*, and especially in its application in John v. 27; and for the reason, why the Greek article is here omitted, which is found to accompany the title wherever else it occurs throughout the Gospels,—I refer to a Critic, who had well considered, and had taken pains thoroughly to understand the subject, before he submitted his opinions to the public, Dr. Middleton. (*Doctrine of the Greek Article*, p. 351—354.) The title, *Son of Man*, he observes justly, "has every where a reference to the *Incarnation of Christ*:"—and he adds, that generally, in the use of the appellation by our Lord, "the allusion is either to his present humiliation or to his future glory:" and therefore, he concludes, we have in this phrase, "though an indirect, yet a strong and perpetual declaration, that the human nature did not originally belong to him, and was not properly his own."

In truth, the very use of the phrase seems almost inexplicable on the supposition, that our Lord was merely and properly a human being: for why call himself by a title emphatically denoting human origin, if *no other* origin could be ascribed to him: why, as Mr. John Jones says, (in a book which he pleasantly calls "*ILLUSTRATIONS of the Gospels*,") and says, I really believe, with a *sincere* intention to *help* the Unitarian cause, why did our Lord, "appearing as man in the midst of men, and exposed to their wants and feelings," thus labour to "inculcate WHAT NONE NEEDED TO LEARN, that he was a human being?" Not exactly for the reason assigned by this ingenious gentleman,—that "the Gnostic teachers denied his *humanity*; and rejected and blasphemed the Son of Man, the Man Jesus, while they affected to honour and embrace the God within him continually." There is one small chronological difficulty in the way of this solution; namely, that there were *no* Gnostic teachers whatever in existence to deny our Lord's humanity during

we shall be told, is all accident: "a mere slip of the pen," or perhaps, "an error of the press." But let it be remembered, that these *two* passages of St.

the whole period of his ministry. But this writer has stumbled very near the truth. Our Lord, in the repeated and emphatical use of the title *Son of God*, had claimed to himself a *divine nature*; he was understood as doing so by the Jews, who charged him, on the repeated assumption of that title, with *making himself God*, and who finally sentenced him to death for that great offence against their law. Having therefore thus claimed to himself a *divine nature*, he was also for the unfolding the whole truth as to the nature which he possessed, led to affirm the *human nature* which was united with the *divine* by his *Incar-nation*. And as the one part had been expressed by the title SON OF GOD, so the other was naturally conveyed by the corresponding form of denomination, SON OF MAN. The Socinians and Unitarians are always willing to forget, that the establishing of the human nature of our Lord is as necessary to our scheme as to theirs; but, at the same time, they should remember, that our Lord's repeated assertion of it, and in the peculiar form of phrase in which it is conveyed, is utterly inexplicable on their system: so that they not only deny to our blessed Lord the appellation, which he claims, of *the Son of God*; but they render him in a great measure unintelligible, when he entitles himself *the Son of Man*.

To give the reader some relief, by passing from the regions of confidence and ignorance to those of a far different character, I shall subjoin the conclusions of a Critic and a Scholar, derived from a cautious and elaborate comparison of the applications of the phrases, *Son of God* and *Son of Man*, throughout the entire range of the N. T. in the original language. Schleusner, to whom the Unitarian Editors and their associates profess a willingness to appeal on all occasions, (although they have excluded his valuable Lexicon from their list of those that are useful for the New Testament,) thus sums up his explanations of those titles as applied to our Lord, under the article ΤΙΟΣ. "Κατ' ἐξοχὴν vero et longe sublimiori sensu, quam qui in ullam creaturam cadat, *Christus*—ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ in N. T. vocatur, ad rationem ejus erga Deum et sublimiorem illam naturam, quæ ante Jesum natum jam exstitit significandam." And again, "Κατ' ἐξοχὴν, in N. T. *Christus*, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου vocatur, ratione scilicet humanæ naturæ, quam interventu divinæ virtutis induit." And, under the article ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ, he expresses himself still more fully and emphatically on the latter designation; observing that the word ἀνθρώπος

Luke, in *each* of which the *two* accidents, the change of the version, and the omission of the acknowledgment, have jumped together, are precisely those, to

is used as in relation to the *female* of our species, in all those passages, in which the title *ο υιος του ανθρωπου* is applied to our Lord; being in strictness, as to his human nature, the Son of Mary; which Schleusner thinks, is expressed in the words *γεννημενος ex ymnairos* in Gal. iv. 4: and, in opposition to the opinion of Less, that this title was used by our Lord to express an abject and humiliated state, he adduces the passage in John v. 27, of which we have already spoken to shew, that on the contrary it was intended as a title of eminence, and as he says, “ut vel hoc nomine edocerentur homines, Jesum esse promissum illum in V. T. Messiam et insignem doctorem divinum, (Ezek. i. 26. Dan. vii. 13, 14.) qui communi nascendi lege a Maria virgine, interveniente divinâ virtute, initia vitæ vere humanæ, haberet, et corpus indueret vere humanum ut quod fuit sapientiæ divinæ decretum, homines per hominem adjuvarentur. Tantum igitur abest, ut hac formula vilissimus ille, ad quem Jesum descendisse fingunt haud pauci, servorum status describatur, ut potius, sive decreti divini sapientiam, sive origines Christi, quas interventu divinæ virtutis cepit, spectas, nihil hoc nomine sublimius, illustrius et magis honorificum fingi et cogitari possit.”—The sort of use which the Unitarians contrive to make of the *name* of Schleusner, the Bishop of St. David’s has, in his late publication upon that subject, most admirably exposed. See *The Bible and nothing but the Bible*, &c. pp. 59—66. 74—96. 111—117.

One would hardly think, after reading the passages which have been here adduced from Schleusner, that any writer could have the hardihood to mention *his* name in connexion with the assertion, that our Lord was not called *the Son of God* in a sense implying any *peculiarity* of nature, or in any other than that of the common Jewish idiom, under which the title was equally applicable to believers at large. And yet this has been expressly done by Dr. Carpenter, who builds the whole of his Unitarian position touching this phrase, upon Schleusner, “whom,” (he adds, to give his argument the greater effect,) “no one can suspect of being a Unitarian.” *Unit. the Doct.* &c. p. 174.—Thus is the unsuspecting reader deluded, and by those who scarcely ever have the words “truth” and “candour” out of their *mouths*. The very article *Thos* too, from which I have adduced Schleusner’s own words, is the very article, to

which the Editors attach uncommon importance, as going directly and explicitly to the *personal nature* of our Lord. This is manifest, as well from the reasons, which, (as we have seen,) they have been compelled by their system to assign for the application of the title, SON OF GOD; as from the great pains taken, by one* of them especially, (in a work intend-

which reference is thus made, for the establishing by Schleusner's name, the direct contrary of Schleusner's opinions.

On the subject of this note, many excellent observations will be found in Dr. Nares's Remarks, 2d. edit. p. 54—60. Before I dismiss the subject, it is worth remarking, that, of the two titles, *Son of God* and *Son of Man*, applied to our Lord in the New Testament, each of them more than eighty times, the former is a title used familiarly of our Lord by all; but the latter is a name applied only by himself, excepting in Acts vii. 56, where he is said to be seen by St. Stephen in the heaven after his ascension; and in Heb. ii. 6. and Revel. i. 13, xiv. 14, the first of which is a quotation from the Psalms, and the other two refer, as the vision of St. Stephen did, to that *exaltation in the heavens*, which, with our Lord's dying words he declared, awaited the *Son of Man*: so that, in truth, except when our Lord himself assumes it as an appellation, it is never used concerning him in the N. T. save only to establish the fact of his having ascended into heaven; which to mortal eye could have been represented only in his bodily form; in that form, in reference to which he had designated himself as the *Son of Man*.

* Mr. Belsham, who is always rich in matter, that, in a research like the present, it is necessary to bring before the reader, has expressed himself upon this subject in such a manner, that I cannot avoid quoting the entire of his observations.—“It is announced by the Angel, Luke i. 35, that Jesus should be called ‘the Son of God,’ on account of his miraculous conception. But it does not appear that he ever received that appellation from any one on that account, it being generally allowed that the fact, if true was unknown during his personal ministry, this circumstance is rather an additional presumption against the truth of the narrative.”—We see what slender reasons will satisfy some persons on the point of rejecting part of holy writ. Surely even a writer, who seems not to concern himself much with the productions of any but Unitarians; and who, like the rest of the writers of that description, appears to

ed as a Supplement to the Version, and published for the purpose of glossing over and defending its various corruptions and mistakes,) to remove alto-

be forever going round and round in the same circle, repeating again and again what has again and again wearied and disgusted ; even he cannot be ignorant, that the phrase, *to be called*, is familiar with the Hebrew writers, as applying to the *nature* rather than to the *actual appellation* of the subject. Perhaps, indeed, he *may* imagine, that when St. Luke, in the very next verse to this, informs us, that Elizabeth “*was called barren*,” the Evangelist means to say that *Barren* was the actual name by which she was distinguished : or again, that when, in chap. ii. 23, the same Evangelist tells us, from the Law, that “every male that openeth the womb, shall be *called HOLY TO THE LORD*,” he intends to assert that this was the true and proper appellation of every first born male of the species both of man and of beast. That this *may* be Mr. Belsham’s idea, is not actually impossible ; for things not less extravagant are to be found plentifully scattered throughout his pages. But surely, whether this be so or not, the criticism just quoted affords no very favourable specimen of the critic’s acquaintance with the sacred writings. The instances that establish the existence of this Hebrew idiom, (if indeed, strictly speaking, it can be called a *Hebrew* idiom, when the examples of κληθίσται for εσται, as every scholar knows, are to be found abundantly in various writers,) are numerous, and perfectly familiar to all who have made the writings of the Old and New Testament their study. But those that I have cited, I have chosen to adduce from the same writer, (as being within the very portion of Scripture, that even by Mr. Belsham himself is admitted to come from the same person,) from whose hand we have the very passage at present under consideration. We see, then, that even though our Lord had never once been *called* “the Son of God,” yet the declaration in this passage would have been nevertheless perfectly true : inasmuch as the meaning plainly is, that he *was in his nature*, that, which this appellation properly denoted.

However, to satisfy this critic, we will suppose, that it *was* the *appellation* that was intended in this place by the words of the Angel. What follows ? Why then he says, “it *does not appear*, that he ever received *that appellation* from any one *on that account*,” (that is, on account of the miraculous conception ;) and consequently he infers the narrative to be untrue. Now, if I understand this gentleman rightly, (which indeed I confess it is not always in my power to do,) he intends to say, that the

gether from the canon of Scripture this portion of St. Luke, as overturning totally the Unitarian solution of the appellation, SON OF GOD, applied to Je-

declaration, that for a particular reason a person shall be called by a certain name, cannot be verified, unless, when he *is* called by that name, there be assigned also the reason for which the appellation had been originally bestowed; and that, consequently, unless those by whom our Lord was denominated "the Son of God," took care to specify, that he was *so* denominated *on account* of the miraculous conception recorded by St. Luke, the declaration in the 35th verse of the first chapter must be given up, as containing a falsehood. Now, in the 2d. ch. of Genesis, we are told, that the female of our species should be called WOMAN, *because she was taken out of man*: in the 17th ch. Abram is to be called ABRAHAM, *because he was to be a father of many nations*: in the 32d. ch. again Jacob is to be called ISRAEL, *because as a Prince he had power with God and with men, and had prevailed*:—and I should be glad to learn, where we find in Scripture the *reasons* for these names assigned by the speaker, when he employs the names. Are we then to reject these parts of Genesis, and the various other portions of scripture in which the reasons for appellations given are assigned, because we do not find the statement of these reasons afterwards accompanying the use of the appellation? Mr. Belsham, who shows no great reluctance to part with *any* portion of Scripture, will most probably answer, yes. Well, but perhaps, we may be able to satisfy him after all, in the case before us, if he will not be too rigorous in demanding from us an instance of the repetition of the *very words* of the reason first assigned for the appellation. If we can shew, that the term, *Son of God*, is applied to our Lord directly in reference to a *divine nature thereby attributed*, possibly he may admit *this* to satisfy his demands; since, in truth, the real cause of his quarrelling with the miraculous conception is, (although he professes it to be otherwise,) because it goes to establish the *super-human* nature of our Lord.

To come, then, to the point. When the Jews assign to Pilate the reason, for which our Lord ought to die, what is the charge? Simply, that "he made himself the SON OF GOD." What, then, is the sense, in which it is declared by the Jews, that our Lord assumed this appellation! Plainly, that of its implying, what the words directly import, and what upon two former occasions they had expressly pronounced them to import, the *divine nature* of our Lord. "We have a law," they say, "and by our law he ought to die, *because he made him-*

sus Christ. Indeed so forcibly and emphatically are the sense and reason of the appellation here pointed out by the Evangelist, that the writer alluded

self *THE SON OF GOD.*" (John xix. 7.) Now, what that law was, is evident from the parallel passages in Matth. xxvi. 65, and Mark xiv. 64, in which it is declared, that the crime, which our Lord had committed, and for which he was to suffer death under the Law, was the crime of *blasphemy*. In calling himself *THE SON OF GOD*, he had been guilty of an assumption of the divine nature, which being, in the judgment of the Jews, blasphemy against the Most High, and overturning, as they conceived, the first principle of their religion, the Unity of God, they of course pronounced, that according to their law he ought to die. For this *blasphemy*, also, the Jews on two former occasions had sought to kill him, when he had merely spoken of himself as the *SON OF GOD*. John v. 18. x. 33. In the first of these, we find the Jews declaring, as the reason why he should be put to death, that he had said, "that God was his Father, (*πατὴρ ἰαὶον*) *making himself equal with God:*" and in the second, we find them assigning as the reason for the same, that he was guilty of "*blasphemy;*" for, that "being a man he *made himself God,*" namely by calling God his Father.—Well, have we now got a proof that the appellation of *THE SON OF GOD* has been applied to our Lord *on account of his divine nature*, on account of *God being his PROPER FATHER*, ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ΙΑΙΟΝ? We have got a proof, that our Lord himself lays down his life *in testimony of the truth of THIS application of the title*. By his acquiescence at his last moments in the sense which the Jews put upon those words, he proclaims his own divinity; and by proclaiming to the world this great truth as the last solemn declaration for which he yielded up his life, he has shewn beyond a doubt *on what foundation* it is that his religion must be built, and in what the *preaching of Christ crucified* must consist. For the most valuable and important observations on this subject, I gladly refer the reader to the conclusion of the Brief Memorial of the Bishop of St. David's: and more particularly to the *admirable* Discourse delivered by the same author in the year 1790 before the University of Oxford; in which it is incontrovertibly shewn, that *The Divinity of Christ is proved from his own declarations attested and interpreted by his living witnesses the Jews*. I beg to direct the reader's attention also to the Sequel to this discourse, lately published by the same author; in which *The Testimony of Christ's Contemporaries to his own declaration of his Divinity* will be found most fully confirmed by his

to does not hesitate to pronounce this very circumstance to be a strong argument against the truth of the entire narrative of the miraculous conception,

Discourses, Actions, and Death. This Sequel is contained in a Sermon preached by the Bishop at Llarnarth and Carmarthen before a general meeting of the Clergy, in the months of September and October 1814.—On the whole of the subject which has been here treated of, I cannot forbear recommending also to particular notice, the observations of Mr. Wilson, from page 1 to page 140 of his “Illustration of the method of explaining the N. T. by the early opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ:” a work, on which I am not surprised that the Unitarian writers have uniformly preserved the profoundest silence; inasmuch as it triumphantly overturns the whole system of Dr. Priestley’s theory of Early Opinions on which they profess to place so firm a reliance, and has erected upon its ruins a complete demonstration of the *primitive* doctrine of the *Divinity of Christ*.

But to return to Mr. Belsham: he proceeds in his note, to say, of the miraculous conception of our Lord, that it is “generally allowed, that the fact, if true, was unknown during his personal ministry.”—“The fact, *if true*, was unknown,” &c. What means this? Is it, that the fact, *if untrue*, might have been known? However, let the *logic* of this pass: it is but one specimen of a thousand. But as to its meaning, (which after all, may be discovered,) what is it that he would infer, or what is it that he wishes to pronounce? By whom is it thus *allowed*, that the fact of the miraculous conception was unknown during our Lord’s personal ministry? Dr. Priestley has allowed it to Mr. Belsham, and Mr. Belsham has allowed it to Dr. Priestley. The critics of this School have all allowed it to one another. But what has been the secret information by which these gentlemen, who have thus civilly agreed to allow this to each other, have been enabled to discover, that the fact of our Lord’s miraculous conception was unknown during the period of his personal ministry? I must beg to ask, whether, “*IF TRUE*,” (a case which Mr. Belsham kindly *allows to me* to suppose in the argument,) this fact was *unknown* to our Lord’s mother, and to Joseph, and to all the parties, to whom, “*IF TRUE*,” the whole transaction was perfectly known. Was the fact unknown to those who knew it? What patience can be proof against such monstrous absurdities, presenting themselves with the confidence of sound reasoning and plain common sense!

and an additional reason for its rejection. (Belsham's Calm Inquiry, p. 263.)

Such is the Unitarian mode of interpreting scripture, on which we have frequently had occasion to remark. It is first laid down, on abstract principles of general reason, that a certain thing *cannot be*. Then comes scripture, declaring in plain words, that *it is*. But then comes forward a *dictum* of Priestley, or Evanson, or Lindsey, or Wakefield, or Cappe, or Belsham, or some body else,* to assert

* There is so complete a specimen of this process, in the treatment of the beginning of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, by the Unitarian Editors, that I cannot forbear noticing it here; more particularly, as the words of St. Paul apply so forcibly to the point at present under consideration. I shall give the passage according to their own version, (though it tends much to reduce the force of the original,) that the full value of their remarks upon it may be appreciated with every advantage they can thence derive.—“Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated to the gospel of God, (which he had promised before by his prophets in the holy scriptures) *even the gospel* concerning his Son, who was born of the race of David, according to the flesh, *but* proved to be the Son of God by power, according to the holy spirit, through his resurrection from the dead; *the gospel, I say, concerning Jesus Christ our Lord.*”—[N. B. It is no great matter, if, in such passages particularly as are at open war with the Unitarian System by teaching the divinity of Christ, there should be, besides the puzzle of a new translation, a little additional confusion from omitting the mark of the beginning of a parenthesis, or, from some other slight matter of this kind, which may easily be thrown upon the press-compositor. In an IMPROVED VERSION with a CORRECTED TEXT, it is not to be expected, the object being of course to *correct the meaning*, that any attention will be paid to the trifling task of *correcting* “slips of the pen” or “errors of the press.” This, indeed, is the less necessary, where, after all the pains bestowed upon a *corrected text*, it is intended, that in the *notes only* the true sense is to be found.]

Now, what is the note of the Editors on the above passage from St. Paul; in which, if words have any meaning, the Apostle shews himself most careful to point out the distinction to be observed between the *human descent*, and the *divine sonship*,

that the words *may*, by some different translation, or punctuation, or some new and ingenious mode of interpreting, be made to bear some other *possible*

of our Lord ?—"The Apostle **COULD NOT** mean, by this *phraseology* and the *antithesis* which he here uses, to assert or countenance the strange and unintelligible notion of *two natures* in Christ ; one the *human nature*, by which he was the descendant of David ; the other a *divine nature*, by which he was the Son of God." That is, the Apostle *could not* mean what he directly expresses. The Unitarians have pronounced, upon general principles, that the *thing itself cannot be* : and therefore St. Paul *could not mean* to say what he *does say*. The peculiar *phraseology* and *antithesis* here used, and which could have been employed *only* for the very purpose of marking that distinction and opposition of natures, which these critics say the apostle *could not* mean to assert or countenance, are to be entirely set aside ; and what the apostle ought to have said, is thus clearly laid before us, by one who knows the apostle's meaning better than he did himself.—"The sense of the passage is *plainly* this, that Christ by natural descent was of the posterity of David ; but that, in a **FIGURATIVE SENSE**," (this is the *plain* meaning of the apostle) "*by designation of the holy spirit at his baptism*" (all this the apostle kept to himself, but now we have the whole of it out *plainly*,) "he was the Son of God : or the *promised Messiah*, which was further proved by the extraordinary exertion of divine energy in raising him from the dead." And then, we are referred to one of the grand authorities, under which the Unitarians occasionally let us *plainly* into a variety of *secrets*, of which the language of the New Testament would otherwise not give us the slightest intimation :—"See Mr. Lindsey's second Address to the Students of the Two Universities."—But, if it were necessary to refer the reader to any authority beyond the very words of the apostle, I would refer him, (besides the great body of learned Commentators, among whom Elsner and Hammond deserve particular consideration,) to the authority of Primate Newcome ; as well, because his observations are applied to the very translation adopted by the Editors ; as, because their direct opposition in the sense of scripture to him whom they propose as the model of their translation, may lead the reader to a juster sense of the imposition practised on the public by the use that has been made of his name.—"*Observe*" (the Archbishop remarks,) "*the opposition*. According to our Lord's *human descent*, he was the *offspring of David* ; but according to the **HOLY SPIRIT** he was the **SON OF GOD** ; and shewn to be such by

meaning. But should all these fail, should the words be too plain, and simple, and precise, to admit any sort of distortion, then they are clearly to

the display of God's power in raising him from the dead, Eph. i. 19. 20—Acts xiii. 33."—I would refer him also to Luke i. 35. where, at the very conception of our Lord, his twofold nature is opened up, being of the race of David by the flesh, but the *Son of God* by the *Holy Spirit*; and in this passage, perhaps, the true force of the word *divinus*, which is used by St. Paul, may be discovered.—I would refer him also, for that gospel, which St. Paul tells us here he was "called" and "separated" to preach, to Acts ix. 20; where we are informed, that the gospel preached by him was, "that Christ was the SON OF GOD:" by which last words is manifestly not meant the *Messiah* or *Christ*, (as the Unitarians would have us understand, and are for that reason anxious to introduce the word *Jesus* into the text instead of *Christ*, but without sufficient authority although recommended by Griesbach, for then his preaching would merely be, that "Christ was Christ;" but, that "Jesus, who was Christ, was truly in his nature the *Son of God*;" that *Son of God*, which he was pronounced to be at his nativity because of his miraculous production by the Holy Spirit; which he affirmed himself to be continually throughout his ministry, even though the Jews accused him of thereby "making himself equal with God;" which he finally persevered in asserting that he was, although death was to be inflicted for the alleged blasphemy of the assertion; and which he *proved* himself to be, as St. Paul informs us, by his rising from the dead, shewing to the world thereby that death could have no dominion over HIM: that, although as to his *human* nature, he was indeed to be considered as *descended from David*; yet that as to that higher nature which belonged to him, his *holy spirit* which could not be affected by death, he was proved to be the Son of God.

I am happy also, after all the flourish that the Editors have made about the impossibility of the contrast between the two natures in Christ being intended in this place by St. Paul, to have both themselves and their great supporters decidedly with me upon this point. For *σαῶς*, they tell us, in John i. 14, (where they are anxious to establish the proper humanity of our Lord,) "peculiarly stands for *man as mortal*."—Mr. Belsham, in his *Calm Inquiry*, (p. 227.) says, that this word, applied to our Lord in 1 Tim. iii. 16, means his being "really and truly a *man*." The same signification is given to the word by Dr. Carpenter, (*Unit. the Doct. &c.* pp. 64. 152. 185. 262.) with the in-

be rejected as *spurious*, because the Unitarians have already determined that *the thing cannot be*.

In the present case, however, Mr. Belsham's

timation also of a secondary meaning, marking emphatically "the frailties of humanity." How then must these critics consistently render the words of St. Paul. *κατα σαρκα*? Manifestly by the words "according to his human nature." And thus, they establish the very contrast, which they explode as ridiculous: for then, his HOLY SPIRIT, in reference to which he was the *Son of God*, is put in direct opposition to his HUMAN NATURE, in reference to which he was the *Son of David*. Thus these profound critics, in their great anxiety to build up a sort of proof of the human nature of our Lord in one place, assist in fortifying the demonstration of his divine nature in another.—The builders of Babel were visited for *their impiety* with a confusion of language, such that they could not "understand one another's speech." But there may be, it seems, a severer visitation: men may be made unable to understand *their own*—"prius demen-tat."—

In truth, this passage of St. Paul's puzzles Unitarian critics extremely: and such of them as have any candour confess it, however they may be determined not to yield their grand position to the difficulty that presses upon it. Dr. Carpenter admits, that the apostle means to mark a *distinction*: which distinction he puts thus for the apostle. "Jesus was of the race of David as to his natural descent: and if he had not been so he could not have been the Messiah: but he was *more*, he was the Son of God." (Unit. &c. p. 234.) And he adds, "that those persons manifest little regard to truth and candour, who assert, that the Unitarians maintain that Jesus was a *mere man*." He then proceeds to make out some sort of distinctions, which Unitarians may *say* they comprehend, but with which I shall not take up the reader's time or my own. But this he admits plainly, that a distinction of nature is marked out; and such as to prove that Jesus was *not a mere man*. This is a great length for a staunch Unitarian to go. I cannot expect him to travel with me farther. But surely we may say, *great is the force of truth*. How ridiculous would it be to assert of our Lord, that he "was of the race of David as to his *natural descent*," (I take even Dr. Carpenter's own distorted translation,) if he were a *mere man*? For, how should a *mere man* come of any race but by *natural descent*.

Before I quit this subject of the acceptation of the word *σαῶς*, as implying what is strictly *man*, I must remark, that the

fellow-labourer in support of the Unitarian Version, Dr. Carpenter, might have relieved him from this *last necessity*. For whilst this writer, yielding to

Unitarians have shewn much modesty in not rejecting all others from the denomination of Christians. For we are told, 1 John iv. 2, that "every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh*," (i. e. say they, as a *real man*,) "is of God"—And they, who do not so confess him, are pronounced not to be of God. The Unitarian might therefore here easily produce his Q. E. D. for the exclusion of all but the maintainers of Christ's proper humanity from the pale of Christianity.

I cannot conclude this note without requesting to be informed by the Unitarian Editors, why,—in speaking of "the strange and unintelligible notion of *two natures* in Christ; one the human nature by which he was the descendant of David; the other a divine nature by which he was the Son of God,"—they did not call in the aid of those distinguished names, which they and their associates so exultingly boast of as auxiliary to their cause, the names of GROTIUS and of LOCKE. Perhaps, however, without troubling the Editors for an answer, a sufficient reason may be found in the simple fact, that both these commentators hold this very "strange and unintelligible notion;" and, wonderful to say, speak of it as familiarly as if it were the most obvious and unquestionable.—Thus we find Grotius, on the words ο Χριστός το κατὰ σάρκα, pointing out familiarly the *opposition between the human and the divine natures*, which jointly appertained to our Lord—"Non secundum το θεον [*divinitatem quæ*] quod in ipso, sed secundum το ανθρώπινον [*humanitatem*." Grotius on Rom. ix. 5:—and in these very words he is followed by Rosenmuller, in locum. Locke, in like manner, in his Comm. on Rom. i. 4. expresses himself.—"According to the spirit of holiness, is here manifestly opposed to, according to the flesh, in the foregoing verse, and so must mean that more pure and spiritual part in him, which, BY DIVINE EXTRACTION he had immediately from God: unless this be so understood, the antithesis is lost." And this DIVINE EXTRACTION the same writer explains to us in another place thus:—"God, out of his infinite mercy, willing to bestow eternal life on mortal men, sends Jesus Christ into the world; who being conceived in the womb of a virgin (that had not known man) by the immediate power of God, was properly THE SON OF GOD, according to what the Angel declared to his mother, Luke i. 30—35.—So that being the Son of God, he was, like his father, IMMORTAL; as he tells us John v. 26." &c. And this inherent immortal nature, the same writer in another place pronounces

the force of overbearing evidence, admits, (in his treatise on *Unitarianism the doctrine of the Gospel*, pp. 353. 358,) that the passage in Luke must be received as genuine; he denies, that it intimates any thing whatever of a miraculous conception. These two Unitarian writers I must leave to settle the matter between themselves. I am glad to find, that I can agree in part with both. I agree with Dr. Carpenter, that the passage is genuine: and I agree with Mr. Belsham, that it *clearly describes* the miraculous conception of our Lord, as *the reason why* the appellation, SON OF GOD, should be given to him.

In short so marked and emphatical do we find the passage in St. Luke, that Unitarians could on no account permit it to hold its ground. One, accordingly, feeling its bearing inevitable, is for turning it out of the canon of Scripture altogether. Another, considering this too violent, and from better acquaintance with the subject knowing the re-

to belong to Christ, when, speaking of our Lord's declaration, John x. 18, that *he had power to lay down his life and power to take it up again*, he adds these words,—“which he could not have had, if he had been a MORTAL MAN,” &c. See Locke's Works, vol. iii. pp. 66, 67, 68.—Why these two eminent writers were not referred to on the present subject, the reader is now probably enabled to conjecture. But what will be his reflections when he learns, that Mr. Belsham, Dr. Carpenter, and all their Unitarian fellow-labourers claim these very writers as concurring in *their* opinions touching the *mere human nature* of Christ, and unblushingly assert this in every publication?—This subject has been carefully and effectually discussed by the Bishop of St. David's in his Letter to the Lay Seceder, and the false assumptions of the Unitarians openly exposed. And yet I entertain not the smallest doubt, that these great names, agreeably to the steady and immoveable effrontery of Unitarian writers, and their invariable maxim of repeating their refuted assertions as if they never had been controverted, will be sounded again and again as of Unitarian authority, just as familiarly, as if no *demonstration* had ever been given to the public of the total unfoundedness of such a claim.

jection of the passage itself to be utterly destitute of authority, is content, if he can turn the miraculous conception out of *it*: at the same time that he satisfies himself, that even without going so far, he could have got rid of what every resolute Unitarian is determined to get rid of at any rate; for that the miraculous conception of itself indicates nothing of a superiority of nature. (Unit. the doct. &c. pp. 21. 25. 174. 352—360.) They, however, who are not disposed, with Mr. Belsham, to cut out part of St. Luke's Gospel; or, with Dr. Carpenter, to nullify the meaning of plain words, and to discharge from the first two chapters of Luke all intimation of a miraculous conception; will not hesitate to pronounce with me, that THE SON OF GOD is a title distinctly assigned in genuine scripture to our blessed Lord, *because* of his miraculous conception by the influence of the Holy Ghost; and, having done so, I have little doubt of their travelling farther with me, and pronouncing also, that the appellation so given and specifically on such account, is thereby intended and announced to designate the divine nature of our Lord.—This passage, then, reaching, as it does and is confessed to do, to the very vitals of Unitarianism, I leave the reader to form his own judgment on the attempt made by the Unitarian Editors to deprive it of its emphasis and force, by dragging in,* even at the expense of all intelligible

* That they violate common sense, no less than their engagements, by acting thus, is manifest from this consideration; that whilst they insist upon the *indefinite* form, and contend that our Saviour must in this place be called a Son of God, that is, one individual of a class so denominated; they are unavoidably involved in this absurd consequence,—that he was to be ranked in that class, *because of his miraculous conception*; for that is what the passage is then made to announce. And therefore a like miraculous conception becomes a requisite character of that entire class: or, in other words, it follows, that *all* who are

meaning, the *indefinite* form to the exclusion of the *definite* form of *Archbishop Newcome*: and this, in two places, *without making any acknowledgment in either*, of their departure from the model which they profess to follow.

We come next to the instance in Number II: in which, instead of "*power to become* children of God," which is the rendering of the *Received Version* and of *Archbishop Newcome*, we find the words "*authority to be* the children of God" introduced by the Editors of the new version: and this, in like manner as in the preceding instance, without the slightest intimation of the change. The degree of value, which the Editors attach to the distinction between the words POWER and AUTHORITY, may be inferred from their observations on John x. 18; where they make a similar change in the translation of our Saviour's words concerning the laying down of his life. Here, having substituted for the *Primate's* rendering, "I have *power* to lay it down, and I have *power* to take it again,"—the following, "I have *authority* to lay it down, and I have *authority* to receive it again;" they assign as their reason for the alteration, that the former "seems to imply, that our Lord's resurrection was the effect of his own power; a* sense," (they add) "which the words

called *Sons of God*, are brought into existence by the miraculous influence of the Holy Ghost. And thus these gainsayers of the miraculous conception, would, according to their own shewing, multiply the instances of it to no inconsiderable extent, as may be inferred from what has been quoted from them at p. 245—249 of this volume.

* In this passage there are two assertions, on which I must make a few observations, for the purpose of shewing, that they are, both, directly opposed to the plain truth of the case. The first of these assertions is, that the words in the original do not convey the sense, which the *Primate's* translation implies, namely, that our Lord's resurrection was the effect of his own

in the original do not convey, and which is directly

power: that is, it is meant to assert, that the word ἐξουσία does not strictly imply “power” in the ordinary sense of the word: and therefore it is, that the Editors render it by the word “authority.” In this they manifestly found themselves upon the criticism of Wakefield; who says, in his comment upon this verse, that “in all the variety of places where ἐξουσία is used, it uniformly means authority, or privilege, or a delegated commission, conferred by some superior.” Now I might here at once refer the Editors, and this their chief oracle in matters of Greek criticism, to the various Lexicographers: but, (as we are concerned with the Greek of Scripture,) more particularly to Trommius, Biel, and Schleusner, who directly contradict this dogmatical and most unfounded assertion of Wakefield, by assigning to the word, besides the species of power implied by the terms authority, privilege, and delegated commission, the sense of power generally, in its fullest and strongest import; and support this sense of the word by numerous examples.—“1. *Vis et potestas efficiendi aliquid, facultas.*”—“2. *Libertas agendi.*”—“3. *Auctoritas,*” &c.—“4. *Licentia agendi et faciendi, jus.*”—Schleusner.—Trommius and Biel, also, in their researches into the application of the word by the Seventy and the other Greek interpreters of the *O. T.* can discover in their use of it no other meanings than *Potestas, Dominium, Imperium, Dominatio*. But as the writers, with whom we are here concerned, spurn at the authority of names, unless indeed they be names such as those of Priestley, Wakefield and Lindsey, (before which they readily admit that all the world should bow,) I will direct their attention to a few passages, which may shew, if not to their satisfaction, at least to that of others, the true value of the criticism on which they build.

In Luke xii. 5, when our Lord warns the multitude, that they should fear him, “who, after he had killed, had POWER (ἐξουσίαν) to cast into hell;” I would ask, whether this power is here spoken of, as belonging to the *Father* or to the *Son*: if to the *Father*, the Editors will be pleased to say, *by* whom it was delegated; and if, to the *Son*, I would recommend it to them to consider, what must be the nature of the Being to whom so vast a power is ascribed.—Again, in Acts xxvi. 18. when Paul is appointed to turn sinners “from the POWER of *Satan* unto God;” when in Romans ix. 21, it is asked whether “the potter” hath not “POWER over the clay;” and when in Revel. xx. 6, we are told of those, “over whom the second death had no POWER:” are we in all these cases, to look to an authority confer-

contrary to the most explicit declarations of the

red, a commission delegated? The word ἐξουσία is that which is employed in these, as well as in numerous other passages, in which to apply the phrase *authority*, or *delegated commission*, would only excite laughter at the expense of the critic.—But to come more decisively to the point: we have, in the Book of Daniel, the rendering of it, both by Theodotion, (iii. 33. and iv. 31,) and by the Seventy (iii. 33. and iv. 34. Chig. MS. Holmes,) the word ἐξουσία attributed to the *Most High God*, and applied to express that *power and dominion*, which he was to exercise over all the nations of the earth, and which was to be everlasting. Are we still then to consider this but as an *authority* “conferred by some superior?” Or, if these critics should imagine, that Theodotion and the Seventy-two supply no authority for the Greek *New Testament*, what will they do with the passage in Acts i. 7, where we are told of the “Seasons, which THE FATHER hath put [ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ] in his own POWER?” Does this settle the point for Mr. Wakefield and his followers of the *Improved N. T.*? And here I cannot avoid an obiter observation upon the manner, in which Mr. Wakefield, has in this last passage *smuggled* the word (I can use no other appropriate phrase,) upon the *English* reader, under the disguise of the term “*disposal*,” passing over the text which so completely overturns his peremptory dictum, in perfect silence; and taking care not to disturb his readers by the information, that it was the *same original* word, that, in “*all*” places, “*uniformly*” signified an *authority conferred by some superior*, that was here employed in speaking of the power of the FATHER. The Editors, who very much admire Mr. Wakefield, have followed him throughout. They too use the word “*disposal*” in this place; they annex no note; and are silent as to the term ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ.

Had the Unitarian Editors been really anxious to learn the true meaning of the word ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ, instead of seeking out a *possible* acceptance, whereby they might exclude an obnoxious sense of scripture, and obtain support for a pre-determined theory, they might have found in Bishop Pearce’s Commentary, on John i. 12, an enumeration of its meanings very different indeed from that of Mr. Wakefield. “The word ἐξουσία signifies *power* in general; sometimes a *natural* power, sometimes an *usurped* power, and sometimes a *power given by human or divine laws*: and in this last case it is best rendered by a *right* or *privilege*, as it should be in 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, 6. and perhaps in Matt. vii. 29. and Mark i. 22.”

We have now seen, to what the Unitarian criticism on the

Scripture." Mr. Belsham also, in his laborious gloss

word ἐξουσία amounts; and from this may be enabled to appreciate the credit due to the first assertion, that the words in the original do not convey the sense which is implied in the Primate's translation. There is indeed another word in the original, which, as the Editors have given it a meaning different from the Primate's, they may possibly have intended to allude to in this position. On this some remarks will be made in the succeeding note; and therefore I omit it here, and proceed to the second assertion of the Editors, as to the opposition between the sense commonly ascribed to the passage, and the declarations of other parts of Scripture. The parts of Scripture to which they refer us, are Acts ii. 24. iii. 15. xvii. 31. Rom. vi. 4. and 1 Cor. xv. 15. The object for which they refer to these parts of Scripture, is to shew, that our Lord is spoken of as having *been raised* from the dead; a thing which they conceive to be contradictory to what is generally supposed to be affirmed in the passage before us, relative to our Lord's resurrection having been the effect of *his own power*. Now, the first of the texts, to which they have here referred, appears most inauspiciously in the van of this adverse array. For what does it announce?—that our Lord was raised up, "*because it was not possible, (καθὸτι οὐκ ἦν δυνατόν,)* that he should be holden of death."—"It was not possible," (says Wolfius, among other reasons,) "because Christ was life itself, and therefore not to be subdued by the power of death"—"*ipsa erat vita, adeoque a morte nunquam penitus superandus*"—Cur. Phil. vol. ii. p. 1036.—But in this search after texts relating to the resurrection of Christ, is it not strange, that the industry of the Editors did not conduct them to the passage in John ii. 19; in which our Lord himself particularly describes the time of his rising from the grave, and the power by which he was to rise. "Destroy this temple," he says, (by which, it is immediately subjoined, he meant the *temple of his body*,) and in three days I WILL RAISE IT UP."—Matth. xxvi. 61, also testifies to the same declaration. What is the reason, that this declaration of our Lord has not been included in the enumeration of texts collected by the Editors: and how has it happened, that neither in John nor in Matthew, as it met their eye, has it drawn from them a single observation? On some subjects silence speaks loudly. The reader will draw his own conclusion. Here then we have two solemn declarations from our Lord himself; one, in the passage which forms the subject of this note, that he had the *power to raise himself* from the dead; and the other in the

upon this New Version, strains with all his might,

passage just referred to, that he would *exert* that power in *raising himself* on the third day. Are we then to set aside our Lord's own declarations, made with the greatest solemnity and precision, in deference to some general expressions of his Apostles. Unitarians are not commonly in the habit of paying such deference to the Apostles, whom they do not scruple continually to charge with blundering and prejudice. However, it is here convenient to believe them in opposition to our Lord himself. But in truth there is after all no real opposition. No difficulty can arise, on this head, to him who will embrace the plain language of Scripture, and admit the truth which it every where inculcates concerning the real nature of our Lord. To those indeed who deny our Lord's divinity, the direct language of Scripture will appear here, as it must every where, inconsistent with itself: and this very circumstance supplies an additional confirmation of the one grand truth which Unitarians so pertinaciously resist. That the *Father* and the *Son*, both possessed (as the Scriptures inform us) of that infinite power which alone could raise the dead to life, should both be said to perform the act of reuniting the spirit of Christ to the body which he had assumed, so as to cause the reanimating of that body and his resurrection from the grave, has nothing in it irreconcilable to reason, and has every thing in it reconcilable to Scripture, and fully satisfies the several declarations of the N. T. upon that subject. Wolfius, in his *Cur. Phil.* (ii. 1055) refers to Fessilius, whose work I have never seen, for an explanatory view of this matter. But to those who wish for full satisfaction upon this point, I would recommend the perusal of the second number of the fifth article of Pearson on the Creed, particularly from page 254 to 258, in which that learned and accurate writer lays the whole of the subject clearly open to the meanest capacity, at the same time that he fully exposes the glosses and cavils with which Socinians have laboured to perplex the truth.

We have sufficiently considered the value of the two assertions, which the Unitarian Editors have so confidently advanced, upon the meaning of the passage in John x. 18. I shall now close this note with the observations made upon it by some foreign Scholars of eminence, to the last named of whom the Unitarians are occasionally desirous to appeal. Wolfius remarks upon this text, "*Ex his manifestum est, Christum vitam propria virtute sibi restituisse.*"—*Cur. Phil.* ii. 911.—Gerdes also, in his *Meletemata Sacra*:—"Christum propria sua virtute

even to the falsifying of the authority to which he refers, to support the propriety of the above observations.*

resurrecturum prædixerat IPSE, Joh. ii. 19.—Ille enim quemadmodum *potestatem habebat* (Joh. x. 18.) *θῆναι*, abjiciendi quasi *animam*, h. e. vitam suam, ita et *ἐξουσίαν potestatem* atque *auctoritatem* habere se profitebatur, *πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν*, iterum resumendi *eam*, ut revocare *eam* rursumque sibi vindicare posset. Eum igitur *semet ipsum resuscitasse* non minus diserte tradunt Evangelistarum et Apostolorum scripta, qui cum vel ita *κατ' ἐξοχήν* sit declaratus Filius Dei *ἐν δυνάμει* Rom. i. 4: qui non alios solum, sed semet ipsum resuscitaverat, juxta illud Apostoli, quod *secundus homo sit SPIRITUS VIVIFICANS.*" He states also, that, by the Scriptures, Christ was to be raised by God the Father; and therefore concludes, that he was raised from the dead by the divine power belonging both to his Father and to himself:—"tertia die a mortuis CUM CÆLESTIS PATRIS TUM PROPRIA VIRTUTE DIVINA EST RESUSCITATUS."—pp. 68. 73, 74.—And Rosenmuller, after thus rendering the clause, "*ut vitam sponte depono ita eam sponte recupero*," gives a paraphrase of the text in the following words: "Nemo, *ne pater quidem*, me cogit, ut moriar pro grege. *Sponte* in me suscepi ut vitam deponam. Sed idem ego etiam *sponte mea* in vitam redibo." He goes on also to observe on the concluding clause, what I could wish those new-light critics, who pretend to derive aid from this writer on the subject of the Atonement, would take into their consideration.—"Notandus est hic locus adversus blasphemias eorum calumnias, qui *Deum injuste egisse* clamant quod *filium innocentem morti tradiderit*. Quicquid Christus passus est et fecit, id omne *sponte in se suscepit*, ex amore erga Patrem et genus humanum. Pater, inquit Jesus, amat me, quia sponte hæc facio et patior; et ego hæc ita facio et patior, ut doceam me esse plenum amore erga Patrem."—Scholia in Nov. Test. ii. 426.

* It is scarcely possible, consistently with truth, to speak in any other terms than those which I have been here compelled to use, of Mr. Belsham's treatment of Schleusner's authority on the word *λαβεῖν* in the passage of John i. 17, 18. The reader shall judge for himself. The word *λαβεῖν*, this writer and the Editors had found it convenient, (after Mr. Wakefield,) to render "*receive*," in place of the usual rendering "*take*:" and to justify this, Mr. Belsham subjoins a note, assigning the meanings given to the Greek word by Schleusner.—"*λαμβάνω*, manu aliquid capio, Matt. xiv. 19: aliâ quacunque ratione accipio, Matt. vii.

It is therefore manifest, how important a difference the Editors conceive to exist between the words **AUTHORITY** and **POWER**: and it seems equally

3: rursum accipio, recupero, Matt. xix. 29. Joh. xiii. 12." Schleusner:—See *Calm Inquiry*, p. 173. Here is the quotation from Schleusner, in the precise form in which Mr. Belsham has given it, even to the inverted commas.

Now in the first place, it is surely a gross falsification of his author, to give, as *one continued quotation* from him, (as the established meaning of the form here employed by Mr. Belsham unequivocally implies,) that, which is an arbitrary selection of words drawn violently together from various parts of a lengthened context, in the present case amounting to more than an entire column of close printing. But, even this is pardonable, compared with what yet remains to be noticed. Will any one believe it possible, that between the words "recupero" and "Matt. xix. 29," which are presented as immediately joined in the quotation from Schleusner given to us by Mr. Belsham, there are found in the original the words that follow—"resumo, i. q. *παλιν λαμβανω*. (John x. 17.)"—that is, *the decidedly active signification assigned by Schleusner to the word λαβειν in the very passage now under consideration, is actually cut out by Mr. Belsham, and the parts on each side adjoining stitched together, so that all now appears one continued texture: and Schleusner's name is made to meet the eye of the reader as an authority for that sense of a passage GOING DIRECTLY TO THE DIVINE NATURE OF OUR LORD, the direct contrary of which sense Schleusner had assigned to it in the part which has been thus purloined.* Now, what shall be said of such conduct as this? Is it too much to charge writers who are guilty of it with direct and deliberate falsehood? Yet this is, in fact, the prevailing practice with Unitarian writers. And these are the persons who are every where loudest in the profession of their attachment to **THE TRUTH**. But it is not wonderful, that they, who are determined to resist and subvert that **ONE GREAT TRUTH**, which our Lord came into the world to inculcate, should, (however loud their pretensions) set but little value upon every other.

But let us attend Mr. Belsham somewhat farther upon the subject of this passage.—From the mutilated extract, which he has given us from Schleusner, he is, after all, able to infer no more, than that the word *λαμβάνω* is not "*necessarily taken in an active sense.*"—To find this out he need not have travelled so far. Every school-boy could have told him that. The last clause of the verse would have told it to him as clearly as a

manifest, that the reason why they have so carefully avoided the use of the latter term in John i. 12. is, that the bestowing a *power* upon the minds

thousand Lexicons. Well, what then? He goes on without ceremony to pronounce, that here it is "to be taken in a *passive* sense." [Indeed if I were to suppose his words used with precision, I should conclude that *τιθημι* to *lay down*, is also to be taken in a *passive* sense: for he says, that in this passage, "though *active verbs* are used, they are to be taken in a *passive* sense"—the verb *τιθημι* is the *only other* verb to which this can apply. Now can he possibly mean, that this too is to be taken in a *passive* sense?—But some writers must not be taken too strictly—and therefore I am willing to admit that this is not his meaning.] He proceeds, "‘I have authority to *receive* it again’ q. d. If I voluntarily expose myself to suffering and death, I am assured by my father that the life so sacrificed shall be speedily restored."—So then, because the verb *may by possibility* be taken passively, it is to be taken passively: and because the word *εξουσια* *may by possibility* be rendered *authority*, it is to be so rendered. And then the passage is fitted for the *gloss*, which it was to be moulded to meet, and which Mr. Belsham has put on it, as above? In this *gloss* it is stated, that the life, which our Saviour voluntarily sacrificed, was to be speedily restored to him,—by the Father of course. Now, will Mr. Belsham be good enough to inform us, how a person can be said to have an *AUTHORITY* to *RECEIVE* that, in the acceptance of which he can take no part, and exercise no option, being but the *passive* subject on which an external power freely exerts itself, without resistance or co-operation from the subject of its action. The *AUTHORITY* TO DO NOTHING, seems an odd species of *AUTHORITY*. Yet this is the *AUTHORITY*, with which, (if we believe these *Improvers* of our Version of the N. T.) our Lord, with great solemnity declares to the Jews, he had been invested. The *AUTHORITY* to be a MERE RECIPIENT, such as the *AUTHORITY* of the *cask* to *RECEIVE* the infused liquid, was surely a strange *AUTHORITY* for our Lord to *assure* the Jews he had derived from his Father. Well might his hearers in that case have pronounced him mad indeed. But if, in the exercise of the power of God to raise our Lord to life, who being a mere man, dead and buried, could have no part whatever in the act, but was simply the passive subject of it, it be still contended, that our Lord is properly said to have had *AUTHORITY* TO *RECEIVE* his life back again; is not the same true of all mankind, and must we not then consistently say of every man, when he

of men, whereby they might be enabled to qualify themselves for that improved condition, in which they should become "Children of God," and heirs

is raised from the grave, that he has been invested with an AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE his life back again? Can any thing be more monstrously absurd? Really, it is lamentable, that they whose time might be better employed than in combatting the follies of Unitarian Expositors, should be detained by such arrant and inexplicable nonsense. And yet it is unavoidable. Whilst the tares are craftily and thickly sowing, it is unavoidably necessary to guard the wheat.—

We have seen how decidedly Mr. Belsham is of opinion, that the word λαβειν is to be taken in a *passive* sense. But, after having settled this point quite to his own satisfaction, he immediately turns to an interpretation of Grotius, which he seems to adopt with great complacency, and in which it is requisite that this same verb should be taken *actively*—"vitam eripere."—In short,—active or passive,—it signifies nothing to the critics we are concerned with, whether it be the one or the other, or a jumble of both together; let it but tend to prove the *Son of God* to be a mere man, "fallible and peccable" like themselves, and it is instantly embraced. Mr. Belsham also goes so far, in his complacent acceptance of Grotius's interpretation, as to admit, not only the *active* sense of the verb λαβειν; but the *obnoxious* sense of the noun εξουσιαν; letting in freely the idea of *power*, which he had before taken such pains to exclude. So that now, since Grotius's explanation does not involve the notion of our Lord's resurrection, and consequently does not involve the exercise of a divine power by our Lord, he is willing, with that writer, to attribute both to the noun and to the verb the fullest exertion of *power* in its most complete *activity*. So much for Unitarian criticism.

The critics of this School (it should be remembered) are ready enough to adduce various readings where they suit their purpose, and to lay upon them full as much stress as is admissible. But they did not think it necessary, in discussing the force of the verb, as to its active or passive signification, in the passage before us, to announce, that, in two MSS. one of them of such high authority as the Cambridge MS. or Codex Bezae, the reading for λαβειν is αρα, settling the active sense beyond the possibility of cavil.—Before I quit the consideration of this verse of John, I think it right to add, that the concluding clause, in which our Lord says, "this commandment have I received from my Father," Bishop Pearce is of opinion is to be un-

of the promises of the Gospel, would argue such an influential operation on the nature of the Moral Agent, as, coupled with the strong and marked de-

understood of the command *to say*, as our Lord had just said:—for which he refers to John xii. 49, 50.

I should not deal fairly by Mr. Belsham, if I did not mention, that he has not given his explanation of the passage we have been considering, as one perfectly insulated; but has in some degree binged it upon the interpretation he had supplied of another passage in the same Evangelist, ii. 19; in which our Saviour had spoken of *his raising up* the temple of his body in three days. The former passage, he informs us is “to be explained upon the same principles” as this. Now, that the author may not be misunderstood, and that we may the better know what those “principles” are, I shall lay the entire of his explanation of this passage before the reader.—“The resurrection of Jesus is *uniformly* ascribed in the sacred writings to the power of God. Acts ii. 32; x. 40; xvii. 31; Rom. vi. 4; viii. 11. Our Lord’s expression is *therefore* to be understood *figuratively*; not that he would raise *himself*, but that he would *be raised by God*. Thus, when it is said, “the dead shall rise,” 1 Thess. iv. 16. all that is intended is, that they shall *be raised by* a divine power. Mark v. 41. John xi. 44; v. 28. 29.”—This is the whole. Now, I beg the reader’s most particular attention to this entire argument; as it supplies an infallible mode of removing the authority of every untoward passage throughout the Scripture, one by one, without the smallest difficulty.—First, it is *asserted*, that “the resurrection of Jesus is *uniformly* ascribed in the sacred writings to the power of God.”—UNIFORMLY:—no exception of course. Now, in the first place, there are to the full as many passages in the N. T. in which our Lord is simply said to *rise* from the dead as there are passages in which he is said to *be raised*; (and even of these last, there is at least a third part, in which it is not *expressed*, by what power, whether his own or that of God the Father, he was to *be raised*.)—On these passages however, I lay no stress, as, where our Lord is spoken of simply as rising from the dead, it does not appear *expressly* by *what power* he was to *rise*, whether by his own or not. But it may give the reader some idea, of the accurate regard to truth manifested by a writer, who positively affirms, that in EVERY ONE OF THESE the resurrection of Jesus IS ASCRIBED TO THE POWER OF GOD; meaning thereby the FATHER. But the point to be particularly observed in Mr. Belsham’s application of the word “UNIFORMLY,” in this case is, that, at the moment

clarations of the divine nature of Christ throughout the context, threatened destruction to the Unitarian scheme: whereas, the giving an *authority* to be

he makes the assertion, he has before his eyes a passage, in which, in language as significant and unequivocal as language can be, our Lord declares that he would *raise himself by his own power*; and in another passage in the very same page of Mr. Belsham's book, our Lord again declares distinctly that he *had the power of raising himself* from the dead. Yet Mr. Belsham, with both these passages in his view, at once positively affirms, that the contrary is UNIFORMLY asserted throughout the Scripture; is asserted of course in *these very passages*; and then proceeds to PROVE, ON THE GROUND OF THIS VERY AFFIRMATION, THAT THESE PASSAGES DO ASSERT IT. Now, the reader will please to carry in his recollection, that this AFFIRMATION of Mr. Belsham's is the *whole of his* PROOF. For then he goes on to state, "that our Lord's expression" (in John ii. 19. viz. the expression which ascribes to our Lord the power of raising himself,) "*is therefore to be understood FIGURATIVELY.*" The argument then runs thus. "The thing which this text *asserts*, is *never* asserted: *therefore* the text is to be taken *figuratively*; for if taken *literally*, it *expresses* that which I have affirmed it does not mean." Then he goes on, *ex abundanti*, (for surely all is long ago PROVED,) to instance the *figurative* application of like forms of expression to those here employed. "THUS, when it is said the dead shall *rise*; all that is intended is, that they shall *be raised* by a divine power." Now, it is important, that the parallel expressed so emphatically by the word THUS, and which is to reconcile every mind to the naturalness of the *figure* here employed, should be carefully attended to. When our Lord speaks of RAISING HIMSELF from the dead, he means that he should "BE RAISED BY GOD;" by the same sort of figure precisely with that, by which, "when it is said the dead shall 'RISE,' it is intended, that they shall 'BE RAISED' by a divine power." In like manner, to present a parallel case, we reason thus.—When a weight ascending by the action of a machine is said in common language to RISE, it is meant that the weight IS RAISED by an external power; therefore, when a man is said to RAISE HIMSELF from the ground, it must mean that he IS RAISED from it by some other power than his own. Some persons indeed might be so scrupulous as to expect, that Mr. Belsham, in order to make his conclusion perfectly satisfactory, should have given some instance of a dead man being said to RAISE HIMSELF, or of a person under any circumstances, being said to RAISE HIMSELF, when it was clearly

ranked in a certain class, might be consistent with a mere declaration of the capacity, and viewed but as the ministerial announcement of a title, or at

meant that he was NOT to RAISE HIMSELF, but to BE RAISED by some one else. Mr. Belsham may possibly consider this as a little too precise. But to extend satisfaction more widely, he may perhaps be induced in a new Edition of his work to supply a few examples of this kind.—The reader has now seen the whole of Mr. Belsham's PROOF.

There are two passages, containing our Saviour's own express declarations of his power to raise himself from the dead: one, as we have seen, in John ii. 19; and the other in John x. 17, 18.—The latter, Mr. Belsham says, is to be explained on the same principle as the former, (helping out the case a little, at the same time by a false quotation from Schleusner:) and the former he disposes of in the manner I have just described; namely, by asserting that it does not mean what it expresses; for that what it expresses is *never* meant any where in Scripture.—

Indeed, it must be remarked, this last is a favourite and never-failing mode of establishing the sense of Scripture with Mr. Belsham and his brother critics of the Unitarian School. The words do not imply a particular meaning, *because* they *never* imply such a meaning.—*Εγενετο* in John i. 3. *does not* signify CREATED; *because* the verb *γινωμαι* is *no where* used by St. John in the sense of *create*.—(See Mr. Belsham and Dr. Carpenter.) *Παντα*, in the same verse, *does not* signify the UNIVERSE, *because* it "*never* signifies the UNIVERSE in St. John's writings."—For these and many other instances of such irresistible argumentation, I refer to the valuable Tract of the Bishop of St. David's already spoken of, p. 74—79. And to the same excellent Tract I would direct the reader for a variety of cases similar to that introduced at the beginning of this note: in which, by mutilated and falsified quotations from Schleusner, that writer's name is made to appear in support of interpretations of Scripture, which he directly condemns; and condemns in the very places, from which the critics of whom we speak, carve out and extract those quotations. See p. 75—96 of *The Bible and nothing but the Bible*, &c. Mr. Belsham does not stand alone, in the pilfering, which the author has erected in this portion of his work, for the exposure of such misdemeanors as the above; but Dr. Carpenter also is there presented as involved in the disgrace.

I had hoped, that I might here at least put an end to the disgusting detail of unfair evasions, uncritical glosses, and un-

most as the transmission of a delegated privilege. It is to be remembered, that the passage under consideration is found in that part of Scripture, where

christian principles, with which I have been obliged most reluctantly to swell this note; but I have this moment cast my eye upon a passage of Mr. Belsham's, in one of the latter numbers of the *M. Repository*, which, both as exemplifying some of the modes of criticism already instanced, and as evincing the progress which that writer's opinions are rapidly making towards their natural goal, I feel myself not at liberty to withhold from the reader. After schooling an old Unitarian pupil, Mr. J. Jevans, pretty smartly, for giving into any thing approaching so near to the true sense of Scripture, as admitting the idea of expiation for *moral* offences under the Jewish system, (favouring him in the course of it, with the appellation of "a very Draco in Legislation," and condescendingly sneering at the gross mistakes of his "good friend,") he goes on to settle the point in the usual manner. "Expiation for *moral* offences is NEVER required in the Jewish Scriptures, and the very idea of it is rejected with indignation and abhorrence." He then proceeds to assert, that "under the Law things unconsecrated were *atoned*, i. e. brought into a consecrated state, by being sprinkled with the blood of an animal victim;" and that the same applies in the N. T. to believers in Christ, who are thus said to be reconciled by the blood of Christ; "i. e. transformed from an unholy to a holy, from a heathen to a Christian state:"—that "in a sense analogous to this, Christ is *said to have died* FOR HIS OWN SINS as well as those of the people, Heb. vii. 27."—And why? because, "being of the tribe of Judah, he was not qualified to officiate as a priest, till he was consecrated with his own blood."—He then winds up the whole with stating, that "this is the idea which runs through the Epistle to the Hebrews, and by which the *fanciful* but eloquent writer endeavours to reconcile his half-believing countrymen to the offensive doctrine of a crucified Messiah:" but that, "*neither does he, nor do any* of the writers of the N. T. EVER hint at the MODERN doctrine" (a doctrine *so* modern as to be only of about 1800 years standing,) "of the blood of Christ being shed as an *expiation* for MORAL offences:" and then establishes the whole by actually declaring, "I am PERSUADED that the idea of a doctrine so repugnant to reason and the divine perfections, and to the most explicit declarations of the prophets of the Old Testament, NEVER ONCE entered into their minds." Vol. ix. pp. 755, 756.—Here is a rant, that surely NEVER was equalled before the

Unitarians always flounder: a part, where every clause (in its fair interpretation) is fatal to their system; and where it is indispensable that they should explain away the just sense of almost every word, in their endeavour to shut out the evidence of our Lord's divinity: a part of Scripture, which though tortured by the advocates of the Socinian heresy into a hundred different shapes, still haunts them with the reassumption of that one hated form on which they are terrified to look, still presents to them the blessed Jesus, the Eternal Son of God, whom they cannot bear to behold as he is, "*the only begotten of the Father*, full of grace and truth."

The word ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ, which the Editors have frequently translated POWER in other parts of the New Testament, they could not afford to render in that

days of Mr. Belsham: a rant, that would be to the last degree ludicrous, if it were not to the last degree shocking. So then, Christ, in all those numberless parts of Scripture, in which he is said to have died for OUR SINS, is not meant to have died on account of our MORAL offences, (what *other* offences can we as moral agents commit?) nor is he said to have made expiation for OUR SINS, other than as he made expiation for HIS OWN SINS. So much for the *theology*. Next for the *Ecclesiastical history*. We have a positive declaration, that the idea, that expiation by the sacrifice of Christ related to the MORAL OFFENCES of mankind, is a matter of MODERN invention; whilst the writings of the Fathers from the earliest age proclaim the doctrine in almost every page, and with a strength which has been the subject of severe animadversion from Socinian critics of former days, who indeed knew something of what the writings of the fathers did contain.—Last of all, the *Reasoning*. Mr. Belsham AFFIRMS, "that expiation for *moral* offences is NEVER required in the Jewish Scriptures;" that it is NEVER referred to the *blood of Christ* by the writers in the N. T.: and that he is "*persuaded*" that it "NEVER ONCE entered into their minds." What shall we say to all this!! Have such men altogether lost their senses, or do they imagine that the world have lost theirs? Yet these are the expositors, who are to enlighten mankind, by the soundest principles of reasoning, and the most correct views of Scripture truth.

dangerous sense here. And whilst, again, in some other places, in which they have departed from their model in using the word *AUTHORITY*, they have not scrupled to confess that they had done so, yet here it was not deemed prudent to draw attention to the difference; and the translation of the *Primate* is, accordingly, quietly slid away from, in profound silence as to the variation. What renders this still the more remarkable, is, that two explanatory notes are attached to this 12th verse, one of them to the clause containing the very word in question: and whilst the Editors entertain us in these notes with some sage and profound remarks of Mr. Cappe, they forget altogether once to mention the name of Dr. Newcome. In one of these notes, indeed, they treat us from Mr. Cappe with a sort of compensation for their omissions elsewhere. For, in describing to us those who are called "Children of God," as the "partakers of a divine nature," they seem anxious to bestow upon men that *divine nature* which they refuse to our Lord. This is not ill contrived for their objects. It tends to familiarize the reader to the idea, that these words may be used in such a sense, as is perfectly compatible with a merely human condition: and therefore, if, after all possible prunings, interpolations, and glosses, they should at any time be compelled to admit, that Scripture attributes a* *divine nature* to our

* The reader must before this be fully aware, that the grand *secret* of Unitarianism throughout, is to retain *names*, and to reject *things*. By this alone it is contrived to keep up any appearance of a distinction between it and open *Deism*; to which, from the days of Socinus, it had continued for a long time to approximate by a gradual progress; but which it now approaches by such rapid accelerations, under the quickening impulses it has received in later days from Priestley, Lindsey, and Belsham, that it has become at length a matter of some difficulty to discover a deficiency of actual contact. Instances

Lord ; it is then to be recollected, that this may be done in a sense, which will not interfere with his *proper humanity*, (as they call it;)—exactly parallel

establishing the truth of the above position, have been plentifully offered in the pages of this work. But there are some very recent evidences on this head, to which I cannot forbear soliciting the farther attention of the reader. In the *Monthly Repository*, (at present the grand Store-house of Unitarian Deism,) we meet with a proposal (Vol. viii. p. 111.) to admit the *use of the phrase*, DIVINITY OF CHRIST, affixing to it the sense merely of a *divine commission* ; in other words, admitting it in the sense, in which it would be equally applicable to Moses or Elijah. The writer, who proposes this, recommends it on the ground of the *denial of the Divinity of our Lord* having proved a *Stumbling-block*, in the way of those, whom it had been endeavoured to *proselyte* to the Unitarian doctrine : and for this reason he laments, that Dr. Priestley had, in a Tract of his, *professed* to direct his arguments against the DIVINITY of Christ ; and he adds, (what deserves particular attention,)—" Were I a member of the Committee of the London Book Society, I should be strongly tempted to move, that the word "DEITY" should be substituted for "DIVINITY" in the title-page of the next edition." That is, I beg it may be observed, Dr. Priestley, who has already become rather old-style from the rapid progress of Unitarianism, is to be presented to the public in the modern taste of Hackney : and a false title to be given to the treatise of their deceased Champion, the better to delude and entrap the unwary.—This suggestion too, we shall see, has not been lost upon the party. For again in the ixth vol. of the same *Repository* (p. 428.) we find, that one of their most active controversialists has published an *Essay*, to establish the propriety of distinguishing between the DEITY of Christ and his DIVINITY : in order that Unitarians may be enabled, consistently with their favourite notions as to the former, openly to assert their admission of the latter. But I submit it to Unitarian ingenuity, whether the matter of *appearance* might not be carried yet farther ; and a tolerable sense discovered, in which the DEITY of Christ might be admitted *in words*, no less than his DIVINITY. Dr. Priestley's remark on William Penn's vindictory declaration, "that he did not deny the ETERNAL DEITY of Christ," supplies a hint towards effecting this point. For, in shewing how this declaration was reconcilable with Penn's belief of the *perfect humanity* of Christ, Dr. Priestley observes, "he only appears to have meant, that the DEITY of the FATHER

to their mode of management in another place, where they endeavour to level God to the nature of man, because our Saviour had reminded the Jews

resided in the MAN Christ Jesus, which is" (he adds) "what every Socinian acknowledges."—See *Triumph of Truth*, p. 4.—Indeed it must be farther observed, that this idea of the admission of Christ's DIVINITY has already proved productive in the hands of Unitarians: for they assert, in the page of the Repository before referred to, that they can now speak of him as "MORE THAN MAN." Quere, may they not soon find some means of devising a sense for the word TRINITY itself; through which they may also profess a belief in that; so that at length, as far as mere words go, (*Dare verba* should surely be the motto of Unitarians,) the Christian may find nothing to startle him on entering the Vestibule of their *Anti-Christian* mansion.—They had long ago secured to themselves the free use of the term *Atonement*; they have now gained to their vocabulary, the *Super-human nature*, and even the *Divinity*, of Christ.—

But, much as has been said in the course of these Volumes on their mode of treating the subject of the *Atonement* in their discussions of that doctrine, I have something of recent occurrence to lay before the reader upon this point, which cannot but convince him, (if he has not been already convinced,) that their real object in admitting in terms a doctrine of *Atonement*, is, the more effectually to overturn its nature and to annihilate its substance. The Editors of the Unitarian Journal already spoken of, having, in their number for last December, notified their intention of making the doctrine of the Atonement the subject of their special examination in a series of ensuing publications, and having for this purpose invited the free communications of their several correspondents: their first number for the present year has accordingly opened the promised discussion: and in the outset I find the following cautionary letter, which I deem too important not to transcribe entire.—"I perceive, that your thoughts" (addressing the Editor) "have been, and will, for a time, be much turned to the Scripture doctrine of *Atonement*. It appears to me very desirable, that some person should give us a simple view of that subject, devoid of all manner of controversy. All persons who read their Bible must see that much is said about it both in the Old Testament and the New. The question then is, *What is it?* IF WE ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN IT ALL AWAY, OR MAKE WHAT IS SAID OF OUR LORD'S DEATH, IN RELATION TO IT, A MERE SHADOW AND THE SHADOW OF A SHADE; AND DO NOT GIVE THE PUBLIC SOMETHING DETERMINATE AND SUBSTANTIAL,

of the language in the Old Testament addressed to men, "Ye are Gods."

But to return. We have now considered a se-

THAT THEY CAN FIX AND REST THEIR THOUGHTS UPON, I AM VERY MUCH INCLINED TO THINK THAT THEY WILL CONTINUE TO VIEW THE SUBJECT IN THE MANNER THEY NOW DO AND LONG HAVE DONE. Nothing, not a word of a controversial nature should be said in it, concerning the person of our Lord, &c. that the reader's mind may not, on that account, be prejudiced against it. Some writers by attempting too much, effect little or nothing. They forget, *hasten slowly*."—To this is subscribed the name of J. Jevans, a staunch and zealous Unitarian, who had been a pupil of Mr. Belsham; but who, as may be collected from the preceding note, holds notions on the subject of expiation of a much higher order than his Tutor. Now, on this letter of a sincere friend to Unitarianism, and well acquainted with its *esoteric*, I make no comment.—Nothing can be here wanting to assist the reader's digestion.—As to the writer of this letter, it is probable, that he felt it *necessary* to suggest the cautions which it contains, from the extravagant manner, in which Mr. Belsham had just before, in the controversy with him on the subject of the Jewish Sin-offerings, represented the nature of the Atonement by the blood of Christ: pronouncing, as we have seen in the foregoing note, that "the blood of Christ was not shed as an expiation for *moral* offences," and consequently not shed in expiation of offences at all; from which it follows, that when our Lord himself declares, that his *blood was shed for the remission of sins*, he can mean nothing that relates in any degree to human offences of any kind at the present day: or that, in other words, *Atonement* (as far as men are now concerned,) means, precisely, NOTHING. *Remission of Sins* might indeed be considered applicable to the *Candlesticks of the Temple* or to *our Lord himself; their sins*, and *his* might, it seems, *be remitted*; (see Mr. Belsham in the paper before quoted; also Imp. Vers. pp. 514. 518.) but as to the entire race of human beings now existing, there is *no sense* of the words, in which, (according to our *Improved Expositors*,) the shedding of blood can be conceived to have any connexion with the *remission of THEIR sins*. Well indeed might Mr. Jevans take alarm, lest even "*the shadow of a shade*" might not be left.

I had nearly forgotten to mention, what certainly ought not to be omitted, that in the paper of Mr. Belsham's already alluded to, that writer has made a discovery of the true character of *sin-offerings*, which he represents to be nothing more than "*finer to the crown*." (M. Rep. vol. ix. p. 754.) So that,

cond case, in which the Editors have departed from the translation of *Primate Newcome*; in which they have made no acknowledgment of the departure; and in which the departure is calculated to promote their peculiar opinions.—To proceed to a third instance of the same description.—

In Number III. we find the words, “HATH ASCENDED,” used by the Unitarian Version in place of the Primate’s rendering, “GOETH.” This however is acknowledged. But we also find instead of the clause “who WAS in heaven,” the following substituted, [“who IS in heaven.”]—Now here the reader should be apprised, that in addition to the obvious and important difference of the words “IS” and “WAS” in this passage, there is another most material one contained in the notation of the *brackets*. The *Primate* had stated in his preface (p. iv.) that he “places between brackets, those words, to which *Griesbach* has prefixed a mark, denoting, that they should *probably*, though *not certainly*, be expunged.” The Editors, who profess to follow *Newcome* throughout, agree with him in this notation likewise, stating the same thing that he has done, precisely. (Intro. p. xxxiii.) The brackets then appearing in the text before us, it is to be concluded, that they appear in *Newcome’s*; and also, that, in the Greek text of *Griesbach*, there is found that particular mark, the existence of which the brackets were to indicate. But the truth is, the Editors here differ directly from both the models which

to the several theories of sacrifice which have been brought under review in the second of the two Discourses in this work and the corresponding Illustrations, must now be added, at least so far as the Mosaic institution of sacrifice is concerned, this new one of Mr. Belsham’s: that, namely, of the sacrifice being a FINE; or, as he expresses it, in relation to the Theocracy, “A FINE TO THE CROWN.”

they profess to follow. The brackets are *not* in *Newcome*. And the mark is *not* in *Griesbach*. There is, on the contrary, another sort of mark found in *Griesbach*, indicating a very different character of the reading—"omissio minus probabilis:" (Prolegom. p. xc.)—a circumstance, which might in itself naturally have guarded even a heedless transcriber against the notation that has been used. We have here then, in the body of the text, a declaration, that the clause in question is, to a *high degree of probability* SPURIOUS: whilst *Griesbach* and *Newcome* ascribe to it no such character, and the latter presents it in a form carrying with it no mark of suspicion whatsoever. Are we then to suppose this careful and significant demarcation by the brackets, to which nothing corresponding occurs in either *Griesbach* or *Newcome*, as well as the substitution of "is" for "was,"—to have been, *both of them*, "slips of the pen, or errors of the press:" both occurring without the slightest notice of the variation; and both occurring together, in a clause of considerable moment in the Unitarian question, and one also to which a note is annexed relating both to the authenticity of the clause and to its meaning:—the attention of the Editors of course specially directed to both the points of difference, and yet neither of them glanced at by a single observation?

With the note itself, I have, strictly speaking, no concern. But, as tending to evince the great anxiety of the Editors to get rid of the words in the text altogether, and consequently as marking the importance they attach to them, the consideration of it becomes of value: inasmuch as the silent desertion of their professed models is thereby rendered the more obviously significant.—First, as a reason for affixing the mark of *highly probable spurious-*

ness, the note states, that “the clause is wanting in some of the best copies.” Now, to come to direct matter of fact; *how many*, and *what* are these copies? The Editors have not chosen to put us in possession of this knowledge.—Upon the whole, *three*: and of these, one being so late as the 11th or 12th century, the testimony reduces nearly to the two remaining MSS. or perhaps, more properly speaking, (one of these being not earlier than the 8th or probably the 9th century,) to the single authority of the *Vatican*, a manuscript undoubtedly of high antiquity. But the omission of the clause in these three MSS,* whilst it is found in *every other* unmutilated manuscript of the great number referred to by *Griesbach*, can be of little weight in the mind of any real critic, and would have been met with derision by the Editors themselves, and set down as a proof of the weakness of the cause it was advanced to support, had it been adduced as a reason for impeaching the authenticity of any passage of Scripture, that appeared to the Unitarians to sanction their notion† of the *proper humanity* of Christ.—However, labouring under misgivings, that this “*some of the best copies*,” when examined into, might be found totally wanting in weight, the note,

* The clause is wanting also in one Version, the Ethiopic; and in one of the fathers, Greg. Naz. in a part of his works, whose genuineness has been questioned. *Every other Version*, however, and *every other Father*, who cites the passage, has the clause.

† When in John i. 18, the very same authorities, which have been here given, (excepting that of the Vatican,) joined with two Syriac Versions, (the Peschito and the Philoxenian,) and also the Ethiopic; and followed by a host of the Fathers from Ignatius down, support the reading of *Θεός* instead of *υιός*; the Editors do not feel it necessary, upon the strength of these authorities to give the name of God, to the *only begotten of the Father*.—Such is the consistency and impartiality of these inquirers after revealed truth.

in the second place, proceeds to say of the clause in question,—“*If its authenticity is allowed, it is to be understood of the knowledge, which Christ possessed of his father’s will.** See John i. 18”—that

* We find a reference here made to John i. 18. Now it is whimsical enough, that on John i. 18. (where the participle occurs exactly as it does here, *ο ων*), the Editors state, in their note, that “*who was*” is preferable to “*who is* :” although they *here* depart from Newcome, in changing “*was*” to “*is*.” Thus even their own references support each other. They change the *past* into the *present*; and then refer to a passage where they say the *present* ought to be changed into the *past*.—But let this go with the rest.—As to the departure from Newcome in this particular, they will probably tell us, that although they have here departed from him, yet they have only given us the rendering of the Received Version. True—but they pledged themselves, *in all cases*, either to abide by Newcome, or to give notice of the departure. Again, they may pretend, that in their change of the *past* into the *present*, they could not at all events be supposed to have sought any advantage to their cause; as by this, they but coincide with the Received Version. But when they have themselves told us, in a passage which they admit to be precisely parallel, that the *past* is the true interpretation, they compel us to look for some special reason for their abandoning it, when it was presented to them by their own model. This reason it will not be difficult to discover, when it is recollected, that the object with the Editors of this new version is, not merely to defeat the doctrines of Trinitarians, but those of all denominations of Christians, that lie in the graduations of the scale between the station of Trinitarians and that part (below the freezing point,) where these new-light Unitarians choose to place themselves: all in short, that attribute to our blessed Lord any quality that would raise him above that meagre skeleton, which these writers present to us in his stead. Now, it is obvious, that, in the *literal* sense of the word “*heaven*,” the *past time* is necessarily connected with the opinions of all these; and even to the unreflecting mass of Trinitarian believers it might be supposed to appear rather startling, to speak of our Lord, at the same time that he was addressing the Jews in a human form, as being at that very time actually in heaven. And, accordingly, Unitarians have not failed to press this as a difficulty quite insuperable. The *present tense* is therefore preferred by the Editors, manifestly with good policy, as leading so many classes of Christians to relinquish the literal

is, the idea of our Lord's being, or having been, actually in heaven, is to be got rid of at all events. The passage is spurious:—or, if that point cannot be carried, then comes the gloss—the words, “WHO IS IN HEAVEN,”—“are to be understood of the knowledge which Christ possessed of his father's will;”—or, as it is given in due form by Mr. Belsham, (who is employed throughout his *Calm Inquiry*, in giving full and fair shape and proportion to the crude conceptions of the Editors,)—“WHO IS INSTRUCTED IN THE GRACIOUS PURPOSES OF GOD TO MAN.” (p. 53.) Thus, they who tell us, that the entire investigation of scripture truth requires only “a sound understanding and an honest mind,” and that learning and subtlety are “by no means necessary to settle the important question concerning the person of Christ, the inquiry being into a plain matter of fact,” (*Calm Inq.* p. 5.)—contend, that the *plain and obvious meaning* (of course) of the words, “WHO IS IN

sense of the passage for that figurative one, which they propose, and which is essential to their system. Thus *Mr. Lyndsey* says, on the words “who is in heaven,”—“these *cannot* be taken literally: for the *Son of Man* could not be in heaven *at the same time* that he was upon earth: it is *therefore* (he adds) to be considered (like John i. 18.) as metaphorical language,” signifying, “the being admitted into the secret councils of God.” (Second Address, p. 60. Sequel, p. 218.) Thus the *present tense* was indispensable to the Unitarian designs upon this verse of John. But it is only in the minds of such as do not clearly discern the real doctrines of Scripture, that any difficulty can be raised, from reading the words in the present tense. For, whether we take the words in the sense in which *Campbell* uses them as, representing our Lord as saying, that *heaven is the place of his abode*; or as stating (with *Doddridge*) that *even then, whilst he was speaking, he was actually present in heaven by his divine nature which fills both heaven and earth*:—the whole comes but to the plain declaration of that, which is asserted in almost every page of the N. T; namely, that our *Lord Jesus Christ* was at the same time both GOD AND MAN.

HEAVEN," IS, WHO IS INSTRUCTED IN THE GRACIOUS PURPOSES OF GOD TO MAN.

What degree of value the Editors attach to the due *managing* of the passage, it will not be difficult to infer from what has been said. But we are not left to inference upon this subject. The truth is, that this passage, and those* that speak a similar

* I subjoin here a few of the passages connected with this particular subject, together with the glosses of the Unitarian Editors.

John i. 18. *ΘΕΟΥ ΟΥΔΕΙΣ ΕΒΛΕΠΕ ΠΩΠΟΤΕ' Ο ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΥΙΟΣ, Ο ΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΚΟΛΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ, ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ ΕΞΗΓΗΣΑΤΟ.*

Common Version.

No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

Unitarian Gloss.

"No one knows the purposes of God, but his faithful servant and messenger, Jesus Christ, who is instructed in his counsels, and has revealed his will." *Calm Inq.* p. 53.

John iii. 13. *ΚΑΙ ΟΥΔΕΙΣ ΑΝΑΒΕΒΗΚΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΝ, ΕΙ ΜΗ Ο ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΒΑΣ, Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ, Ο ΩΝ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΟΥΡΑΝΩ.*

Common Version.

And no man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, [even] the Son of Man, which is in Heaven.

Unitarian Gloss.

"No one has ever been admitted to a participation of the divine counsels, except the Son of Man, Jesus of Nazareth, who has been commissioned to reveal the will of God to men, and who is perfectly instructed and qualified for this office." *Calm Inq.* p. 53.

John iii. 31. *Ο ΑΝΘΡΩΠΙΝΟΣ ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ, ΕΠΑΝΩ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ. Ο ΩΝ ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ, ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ ΕΣΤΙ, ΚΑΙ ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ ΛΑΛΕΙ' Ο ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ, ΕΠΑΝΩ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΕΣΤΙ.*

Common Version.

He that cometh from above, is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth, he that cometh from heaven is above all.

Unitarian Gloss.

"He who cometh with a divine commission is superior to all: he who is of the earth, manifests the origin of his teaching, and his words have not their requisite authority. He who cometh with a divine commission, is superior to all."

language in the sixth chapter of John, have always

Calm Inq. p. 55. Unit. the
Doct. &c. p. 261.

John vi. 38. Κατέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Common Version.

I came down from Heaven.

Unitarian Gloss.

"My doctrines and mission are of divine authority." Calm Inq. p. 60. Imp. Vers. p. 219.

John vi. 62. Εὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα, ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρῶτον.

Common Version.

What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?

Unitarian Gloss.

"What if ye shall see the Son of Man displaying a still more intimate acquaintance with the purposes of God, and revealing truths which would be still more remote from your apprehensions, and offensive to your prejudices? (Unit. the Doct. &c. p. 254.)"—or, as Mr. Belsham has it,—“go farther out of your reach, and become still more perplexing and mysterious?” Calm Inq. p. 67.

On the last text Mr. Belsham remarks, that our Lord had purposely employed “enigmatical discourse” in this place, that he might offend and repel his selfish hearers: and that, in the 63d verse, he desires them to look to the “hidden meaning” contained in it as the only thing useful. Thus we see, that the “inquiry into a plain matter of fact” (Calm Inq. p. 5.) turns out, when Mr. Belsham pleases, the investigation of the *hidden meanings* of the *enigmatical* discourses of our Lord, which at times he purposely rendered still more *perplexing* and *mysterious*: and this, it must be observed, not merely for the purpose of misleading those whom he immediately addressed, but with the certain effect of misleading thousands and tens of thousands of sincere and humble followers. For, even down to the present day, under the supposition that our Lord’s words meant what they plainly express, do we not find that the Christian world has remained altogether unacquainted with the hidden meaning of the last important text; and might indeed remain for ages yet to come unacquainted with it, were it not, that Mr. Belsham has, as he informs us himself, for the first time made the discovery? And, unfortunately, even now that he has made it,

puzzled Unitarian writers more than almost any

the interpretation, he tells us, is so "different from the plain meaning of the words," that it will be "called a forced" one; and will therefore most probably after all be rejected by the unmanageable common sense of the world. Le Clerc, it is true, he admits, "seems to have hinted at something similar;" but the actual full discovery of it has been reserved for himself. At the same time he proposes it, (as he *avers*,) with great "diffidence:" and his respect for St. John is such, that he seems glad, that "there is no occasion to have recourse" (like Dr. Priestley,) "to the supposition of a lapse of memory in the Evangelist." (Calm Inq. p. 65.) His hidden meaning has enabled him to *get rid* of the inference of our Lord's pre-existence, *without* that supposition. One thing undoubtedly must be admitted, that whatever be the *mystery* here, Mr. Belsham is the best entitled to explain it: for it has been, all of it, his own creation. The powers of language cannot give greater plainness: nor can any powers of confounding language that this writer may call to his aid, (and scarcely any can be greater than those he has here employed,) involve our Lord's words in the slightest perplexity. Mr. Lindsey, from whom Mr. Belsham has copied most of his expositions of scripture, had been rather unfortunate in his experiments on this passage: for, having admitted, that, our Lord spoke here of his *actual ascension into heaven* which was to take place after his death, he was obviously bound to explain the words "*where he was before*" in reference to the same place, and so to admit our Lord's *previous existence in heaven*. But as *this* was by no means to be conceded, he was obliged to make the relative, (whose force the word *where* possesses,) mean something different from its own antecedent. "When you shall see me go up *to heaven*, to God (alluding to his future ascension,) *where I was before*; i. e. from whom I have received my instructions and authority." (Sequel, &c. p. 221.) This was too monstrous. It was too open a subversion of the principles of language. Mr. Belsham, therefore, seeing no way for him in this direction, was driven upon the wonderful discovery which he has made.

I do not mean to enter into a formal exposure of the Unitarian glosses that have been cited. They sufficiently expose themselves. I have adduced them merely to show, to what sad straits Unitarians are reduced, in their endeavours to escape from the force of plain Scripture language: and what consequence they attach to every circumstance, however minute, that may enable them to fritter away the evidence of our Lord's

other in the New Testament. Of the text before

pre-existence. The Bishop of St. David's, in his excellent Tract, to which I have already frequently referred, has exhibited various other such glosses, and observed upon them with the ability and learning which belong to him. (The Bible, &c. p. 68—96.) Dr. Nares also, in his Remarks, (2nd Ed. p. 102—109,) has judiciously exhibited the weakness and inconsistency of the principle, on which these glosses are attempted to be sustained. With respect to the true and undoubted meaning of the passages themselves, that has been so firmly established, and placed upon such an immovable foundation, by all the great commentators who have treated of them, that as for the idle attempt of the unlearned and sophistical critics of the Unitarian School to disturb it by their expositions, (and by *such* expositions,) they might as well indulge in the hope of shaking St. Paul's with a breath. I shall therefore detain the reader with but a few remarks: and these, not for the useless purpose of defending texts, that do not require defence against such criticisms; but for one which I conceive to be more important, that of making him a little better acquainted with the absurdity of the criticisms, and the incompetency of the Critics.

On John iii. 13. it is observed by the Editors of the Unitarian Version, and enforced with much emphasis by Mr. Belsham and Dr. Carpenter, that to "*ascend into heaven*," signifies "to become acquainted with the truths of God:"—and that consequently, the "correlative" to this, (the *opposite*, they should have said,) to "*descend from heaven*," must mean "to bring and to discover those truths to the world." Imp. Vers. p. 208. Calm Inq. p. 48. Unit. the Doct. &c. p. 253. Now, allowing these gentlemen all they wish to establish as to the first clause—that *to go up into heaven*, means *to learn and become acquainted with the counsels of God*—what must follow then, if they reasoned justly upon their own principles? plainly this, that *to come down from heaven* being precisely the *opposite* of the former, must mean *to unlearn or to lose the knowledge of those counsels*: so that, so far from *bringing and discovering* those counsels to mankind, our Lord must have *disqualified* himself from bringing any. Had indeed "*ASCENDING into heaven*" meant "*BRINGING the truth (any where) FROM men*," then "*DESCENDING from heaven*" might justly be said to mean "*BRINGING it back TO men*." Whatever, in short, *ASCENDING* may be supposed to signify *in any figure*; *DESCENDING* must signify the *opposite*, if *the figure be abided by*: and therefore if to *ASCEND* be to *learn*, to *DESCEND* must be to *unlearn*. When Æschines, in the pic-

us Mr. Belsham confesses, that it “is a text, the

ture of the Theban calamities, which he presents to the Athenians, speaks of the misery of their being reduced *μιταμνησθαι* *την ελευθεριαν*, he clearly conveys the idea of the *opposite* of *learning* liberty. Had he been told by a Unitarian Critic, (the hypothetical anachronism will I hope be pardoned,) that that *opposite*, instead of being to *unlearn*, or *lose the knowledge* of liberty, was to *bring* and *spread the knowledge* of it every where, he would have found himself sadly mistaken in the force of that fine expression with which he meant so powerfully to work upon the feelings of his countrymen. Mr. Belsham, indeed, contents himself with *asserting*, that “the figure is preserved, if the person spoken of *ascends* to *learn* heavenly truths, and *descends* to *communicate* them.” (Calm Inq. p. 51.) Now can any conceivable meaning be assigned to this? *Ascends, where?*—no where. *Descends, whence?*—From no place. The “figure then is preserved” by using the words “ascend” and “descend” when there is neither *ascending* nor *descending*. Mr. Belsham and the Editors, for the word *ascend* read *learn*, and for *descend* read *communicate*: and yet would *retain* the words in the very figure that has *dismissed* them. Let them admit an actual *ascending* and *descending*, and then indeed the *opposition* is preserved, but the *figure* is gone, be the *objects* of the ascent and descent what they may. Thus these critics employ the words *at the same time* in a literal and in a figurative sense. If we say, you destroy the opposition, then they present the words *ascend* and *descend* literally. If we say, then you grant an actual *ascent* and *descent*, they immediately tell us they use the words but figuratively.—“Quo teneam”—? *To communicate* is manifestly *not the opposite* of *to learn*: so far from it, that in the Hebrew language it would be actually considered but as a different conjugation of the verb: thus Hiphil converts the verb *למד* from the one sense to the other, and the verb *למד* is every where applied to both indifferently. In the true sense of the word *communicate* or *teach*, which is to *cause others to learn*, if “the figure were properly preserved,” it would be said, not that our Lord *descended from heaven*, but that he *made others to ascend thither* as he had done himself.

Lud. Raphelius, who was indeed a scholar and a reasoner, and therefore knew how to give to all these considerations their proper weight, felt it impossible, although he had been led to admit the figurative meaning of the first clause, to allow it to the second. “Facile quisquam in has cogitationes incidere posset, ut putet, si ASCENDERE IN CŒLUM idem sit, quod SCIRE mysteria

right understanding of which is of *great importance*

divina, oppositum DESCENDERE idem fore quod NESCIRE." (See his Preface to his Father's Annotations, §. 17.) And accordingly, this writer, whose knowledge enabled him to perceive, that the objection was *vital*, and could not consistently with any sound principle either of criticism or logic be overturned, did not hesitate to reply to it, that the *second* clause was to be taken *literally*; nothing being more usual than that two words of opposite import should be taken, in the same sentence, the one in a *figurative* and the other in a *literal* sense. In this he repeats the opinion of another distinguished critic; and out of the examples, which, he says, abound in the Sacred Writings, thinks it necessary to adduce but one, from 1 Thess. v. 4, 5, 7, 8, in which the words *day* and *night* are manifestly used in this manner. Mr. Belsham, however, directly contradicts the position of Raphellius; and asserts, that in the passage before us, "if the first clause is figurative, the second is figurative: and if the first is literal, the second is literal." (Calm Inq. p. 50.) So say the Editors (of whom Mr. Belsham is one) with increased emphasis. (Imp. Vers. pp. 208. 226.) This in truth they deem the great strength of their cause: and on this principle they confess it is, that they are enabled to explain away the meaning of the phrase *descend from heaven*, "WHEREVER IT OCCURS" throughout the writings of St. John. (Imp. Vers. p. 208.) As this then is a main point, Mr. Belsham is careful not to admit the instance adduced by Raphellius as sufficient; and demands more examples, before he will consent to relinquish this essential canon of Unitarian criticism. Now, I should certainly not hesitate to comply with Mr. Belsham's demand by supplying the examples he requires, but that he and his brother editors have saved me all trouble upon that head, by producing sufficient from their own stores, and bearing also upon the very question before us. John xiii. 3. and xvi. 28. they translate, "He came from God, and was going to God:"—and "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." The note of the Editors on the former verse, and consequently upon the latter, (on which they refer to the former with which it corresponds,) thus explains the second clause—"he was going to God, to give an account of his charge: his public mission and ministry being ended." That is; the Editors take the words of the *second* clause, *literally*, of our Lord's departure from the world; and yet they at the same time insist on the *figurative* application of the *first* clause, as in reference to their sense of the words in John i. 6.—Mr. Lindsey, also, (the

in settling the controversy concerning the pre-

favourite expositor of the Unitarians,) in like manner with the Editors, takes the two corresponding clauses in these verses, the one in a figurative and the other in a literal sense: and for the purpose of justifying his use of the words "*coming into the world*" in a *figurative* sense, whilst the words "*leaving the world*" must be taken in a *literal* one, he adds, that "it is frequent with the best authors, and the *sacred writers in particular*, when the same words are put in opposition to each other, to take the *one* in a *literal* and the *other* in a *figurative* sense:" and in support of this he instances, besides the passage in 1 Thess. already adduced from Raphelius, Matt. viii. 22. (See Comment. and Essays, vol. i. pp. 395, 396.)

Now, I must beg the reader's attention to this assertion of Mr. Lindsey's, as tending to supply us with a direct proof of a degree of unfairness in Mr. Belsham's treatment of this subject, to which I should be unwilling to give the true appellation. He had, as we have seen, pronounced the single instance adduced by Raphelius insufficient to establish his position: and had observed upon Raphelius's assertion that examples were numerous—"it is singular, that if examples are so numerous, only one should be produced:" (p. 51.) clearly intimating, that he knew of no other, that could be advanced in behalf of Raphelius's opinion. Now, independently of those two very important examples which the Unitarian Editors (himself included in the number,) have supplied, we find him (at p. 104 of his *Calm Inq.*) actually refer to the very example quoted by Mr. Lindsey; and repeat his very words, which have been just cited, in support of the admission of both the figurative and the literal sense in the contrasted clauses. Mr. Belsham, then, *knew* of other examples besides that one adduced by Raphelius; and yet speaks and argues as if he *did not*: and draws his conclusions, and establishes his canon on the ground that none other *could* be adduced. Is this the love of truth which belongs to Unitarians? Long may such truth be the "*aversion*" of the clergy of that church, which he indecently and presumptuously reviles. It is no apology for Mr. Belsham, that he is desperately pushed in this case, and that unless he can establish his canon, all is over with Unitarianism, and the doctrine of the pre-existence rises triumphant. He will not content himself with begging quarter, like Mr. Lindsey, when, after struggling in vain to extricate himself from the meshes of that net in John vi. 62. in which all Unitarians are caught, he ends his fruitless endeavours with saying—"But should we not have been able to develop its mean-

existence of Christ." (Calm Inq. p. 40.) The

ing, will any be so injudicious as to say, that one obscure passage concerning Christ," (so obscure as simply to say that our Lord was to *ascend where he had been before*,) "is to be set up against the whole stream and tenor of the scripture declarations concerning him?" (Second Address, p. 71.) This, it will be readily admitted, is a decided confession on the part of Mr. Lindsey, that he is not able to divest this passage of a sense which establishes the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence. However, as he finds it so intractable, he brands it as "*obscure*," (as well might he speak of the darkness of a sun-beam) and then half-supplicates, that it shall not be urged in support of a doctrine which it unequivocally announces; threatening at the same time to call any person "injudicious" who shall give it this obvious application.

Mr. Belsham, however, does not seem to think the terror of this imputation a sufficient safeguard; and therefore deems it more prudent not to make any such confession as Mr. Lindsey has made, lest an ungenerous use might be made of it. He saw that Mr. Lindsey had been brought into his difficulties, by allowing in two antithetical clauses, a figurative interpretation of the one, and a literal interpretation of the other; and therefore he was resolved, at all events, *per fas et nefas*, to maintain the canon, that requires *both* to be taken *literally*, or *both figuratively*. So he and the Editors put the canon, *pro forma*, with an air of great impartiality; but as they have in truth turned almost the entire of the N. T. into figure, the latter member of the canon being what they really held in view, the former they might as well have omitted. They are undoubtedly somewhat puzzled in the application of this rule to the passages in John xiii. 3. and xvi. 28: and, as I have already mentioned, the Editors actually desert the canon here, if their words have any meaning. But Mr. Belsham, when he stands single, and detached from his brother Editors, takes a different ground; and with a hardihood that falls to the lot of few, (and that might almost tempt one to exclaim with Horace, "*O te Bollane cerebrī felicem*,") at once removes the difficulty, by asserting that *all is to be taken figuratively*. "As Jesus came into the world, when he appeared in public as a messenger from God; so conversely, he *left the world*, and *returned to the Father*, when his mission closed, and he ceased to appear any longer as a public teacher." (Calm Inq. p. 104.) So that, in Mr. Belsham's idea, our Lord *left the world only in a figure*; as a person is said to leave the world, who retires from public life. Our Lord then

corresponding text in John vi. 62, he also admits,

means nothing, in reality, of *leaving the world*, and *going to the Father*, when he says he is about to do so. Mr. Belsham, I believe, stands the single writer in the whole world, (unless *possibly* Dr. Carpenter, whose meaning I don't quite understand, may agree with him,) that could venture such an assertion. The thing is too clear for doubt. All commentators of whatever description, Arian and Socinian, as well as Trinitarian, have hitherto, however they might endeavour to explain it, uniformly admitted, that our Lord spoke literally of his leaving the world and going to the Father. But Mr. Belsham says, they are all wrong—it is no such thing—“it is better to take both clauses figuratively.” And this is precisely his *proof*: neither more nor less. “IT IS BETTER.” Why? Simply because it is better to degrade the *Son of God*, the *Saviour of the world*, to the condition of mere man. Mr. Belsham has no where assigned any other reason, why “IT IS BETTER.”—As the *Monthly Review* will not be suspected of any extravagant leaning to orthodoxy, I will quote here a passage from it upon this subject.—“When, however, the coming *from* is contrasted with the return of Christ *to* the Father, as in John xvi. 28, where the obvious meaning of his words is, ‘I left the Father to come to you; again I leave you to go to the Father,’ it seems *impossible to evade the inference*, that Christ existed before his appearance amongst men.” (vol. lxviii. p. 271.) In contending, that all here is *figure*, Mr. Belsham, it should be observed, not only flies in the face of the common sense of mankind, but he directly contradicts the declaration of the Scripture itself upon this head. “His disciples say unto him, ‘So now thou speakest *plainly*, and speakest *no dark speech*;’” no figure of speech, but language in its plain, obvious, and literal acceptation. So little did the disciples imagine, that when our Lord informed them, that he was about to *leave the world and go to the Father*, he meant to say that he was *not* to leave the world and go to the Father, at all. But Mr. Belsham is used to set but little value on the judgment of an Apostle. Priestley, Lindsey, or Cappe, have more weight with him at all times than Peter, Paul, or John; and display infinitely a clearer and more unprejudiced perception of the truths of revelation.

We have seen that Mr. Belsham strenuously maintains, that “ascending into heaven” merely signifies *knowing the divine counsels*: that when our Lord describes himself as “coming down from heaven,” and again as “ascending up where he was before,” he means only, by the first, that he *had a divine au-*

has always been considered as "the palmary argu-

thority; and by the second, that "*having spoken what had given offence he would go on to speak things still more perplexing and offensive to his hearers* : and that when he talks of "leaving the world and going to the Father," he intends simply to announce the *finishing of his ministry*. After a lengthened review of the various passages in which these and similar expressions occur, a review extending through more than a hundred pages, Mr. Belsham is found congratulating himself on his success in proving, that these, and such phrases, wherever they occur, mean nothing whatever of that which they express, neither of *going into heaven*, nor of *coming from heaven*, nor of *going to the Father*; but that they plainly and solely relate to the *learning and revealing the divine purposes*. (See *Calm Inq.* p. 152.) So extended an examination of texts of Scripture Mr. Belsham had however rendered in a great measure unnecessary; for, by his knowledge of Astronomy he pronounces himself entitled to assert, that no such thing as a local heaven can possibly exist. This is "a puerile hypothesis," which the "modern discoveries in Astronomy" enable him to laugh to scorn. What these "modern discoveries in Astronomy" are, Mr. Belsham has not informed us. Not only his *Morals* and his *Theology* have been given to the world, but his *Logics* and *Metaphysics* also have been vouchsafed to us, together with a slight specimen of his *Mathematics*. What a pity that his *Astronomical* discoveries have not likewise been made known! It must indeed be observed, that he feels himself so strong upon the *just and natural views* of scripture language which he has presented to the reader, that he voluntarily forbears to lay that stress upon this *a priori demonstration*, which the cogency of his *Astronomical* proofs would, it is to be supposed, have justified. had he produced them. To explain the matter more fully, he adds, that the whole of the idea of a "local heaven" is an "absurd Jewish notion," for that "God is at all times equally and every where present: and heaven is a *state*, and not a *place*, and that to be perfectly virtuous and perfectly happy is to be in heaven, whatever be the local situation of the being in question." (p. 55.) It must follow of course, that *being in heaven*, or *ascending into heaven*, considered locally, can be no other than a gross absurdity, and of course can never be the meaning of scripture, under any form of expression however unequivocal. To direct Mr. Belsham's attention to the numerous passages, throughout the Old and the New Testament, in which the idea of a local heaven is explicitly conveyed, would be vain. To direct his at-

ment for the pre-existence." (p. 64.) And, accord-

tion to the Bishop of St. David's remarks upon this subject in his Letter to the Bishop of Gloucester (p. 15—17) would be equally vain. But I should be curious to learn, in what manner Mr. Belsham and his brother Editors would dispose of the passage in 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; and in what sense they would set about explaining our Lord's *descent from heaven* as it is there described, on which they have in their comment taken good care to preserve a profound silence.

But, having seen, that Mr. Belsham has established by his Criticism that the words "ascending into heaven" *do not* mean "ascending into heaven," and by his Astronomy that they *not* mean it; what shall we say, if we find this very writer contending, on another occasion, for this very ascension of our Lord in a *literal* sense; and contending for it, in a part of Scripture, where there are no words to express it; and where, in truth, it is manifest almost to demonstration, that no such thing has been intended. The passage I allude to is 1 Pet. iii. 19, in which the simple expression *Πορευθεis*, *having gone*, Mr. Belsham asserts, is to be understood of our Lord's *ascension into heaven*, "*postquam in cœlum ascendit*," as he adopts from Grotius. Thus the mere word which signifies to *go*, is made to convey that *ascent into heaven*, which the same word, when coupled with *the father*, (*I go to the father*, *πορευομαι προς τον πατερα*), and even the very phrase *go up into heaven*, are not allowed to signify; and which, from astronomical proofs, it is averred, they *could not* signify.—Dr. Carpenter, whose criticism and science both coincide with those of Mr. Belsham, in depriving the several passages that speak of our Lord's *going up into heaven*, and of his *descending from heaven* of any signification, or the possibility of any signification, at all connected with the actual ascent and descent which they literally express, (Unit. the Doct. &c. pp. 256, 257.) coincides with him likewise in attributing to the simple word *πορευθεis*, in this passage of 1 Peter, the idea of an *actual ascension into heaven*. See Unit. the Doct. &c. p. 227: to which page I would refer the reader for one of the most complete specimens of Unitarian exposition to be met with in the same narrow compass: it seldom happening, that it is necessary, even for the Unitarian, to disturb the just meaning of *every* word in an entire passage of scripture; which is almost literally the case here. The violent departure from all principles of criticism and grammar in the explanation given of it by the Unitarians is perhaps their best refutation. The remarks of the Bishop of St. David's on the passage itself, and on the Unitarian treatment of it, are well

ingly, he labours with all his might through no less than eight and twenty pages of the most extraordinary quagmire in which any person pretending to criticism ever plunged, for the purpose of removing or overlaying, that obnoxious* sense which until

worthy of attention; and particularly his animadversions on the unfair use made of Schleusner's name by Dr. Carpenter; by whom the authority of that writer has been applied to give countenance to that interpretation of the passage which he directly opposes. (The Bible, &c. pp. 87, 88.) With the sense of the text itself which has been again and again abundantly established beyond the reach of Unitarian cavil, and on which the Bishop of St. David's and Dr. Nares have recently referred to the best sources of interpretation, I mean not to concern myself. My object is merely to show how Unitarian critics proceed in their treatment of scripture, asserting and retracting; raising up and throwing down; demonstrating the impossibility of a certain thing at one time, and grounding arguments on the familiar assumption of this very thing at another: and all simply referred to the one standard, "IT IS BETTER;" that is, it corresponds better with the Unitarian theory, that has been laid down, antecedent and paramount to Scripture; and by which, being *established* by REASON, (so at least they tell us,) Scripture is in all cases to be judged. Thus our Lord's ASCENSION is to be let in here, where it is *not* spoken of; and to be rejected in other places, where it *is* spoken of: and both for the same reason. Our Lord's pre-existence is evaded in the one place by the *rejection*, and in the others by the *admission*. "IT IS BETTER," therefore, as Mr. Belsham says, to act thus in these several places respectively.

* It must be observed, that the *sense* I speak of here is the *primary* sense of the words, implying a *local ascent and descent*, and a *real heaven*; which the *old Socinians* (as has been adverted to p. 87. vol. i. of this work,) applied to the notion of our Lord's being taken up into heaven after his baptism: so that whilst they admitted the plain and obvious meaning of the words, they avoided the inference of the *pre-existence*. Socinians, again, of a later day, speak of our Lord's being in heaven as a matter of *vision*, (like that of St. Paul,) which he had not been able to distinguish from reality. But, however they might explain the matter subsequently, none ever attempted to clear away the meaning of the words altogether in the first instance, as the Unitarians of the present day have done.

the present day had been given to these passages by Christians of *all parties and denominations*, *Socinians* themselves even not excepted. At the same time, we find, at the conclusion of his labours, the confession fairly made, that the interpretation which he had been toiling to establish, "will be called a *forced* interpretation: and that it is certainly very different from the plain literal meaning of the words." (p. 67.) However, it is an interpretation, which recommends itself most strongly to Mr. Belsham, by its efficacy in clearing away from a part of Scripture which had been *hitherto supposed to speak expressly* of our Lord's pre-existence, and to contain allusions to his death, his atonement, and the institution of the Eucharist, every notion connected with these subjects. (p. 68.) Whatever tended to smooth the way to an interpretation productive of such vast advantages to the Unitarian cause, so vast as to strike at the foundation of the great essential truths of Christianity, must have been acceptable; and, therefore, the (*unnoticed*) departure from the *Primate* and *Griesbach*, in John iii. 13, was, to say the least of it, not unseasonable.—To go now to the fourth instance.

In Number IV. we find the passage in Rom. ix. 5, which is generally admitted to contain one of the most direct and forcible declarations of our Lord's divinity, that can be instanced throughout the entire of the New Testament. Michaelis does not hesitate to assert in terms the most unqualified, that "Paul here delivers the same doctrine of the divinity of Christ, which is elsewhere unquestionably maintained in the New Testament. Dr. Doddridge, in his comment on the place, describes it as "a memorable text containing a proof of Christ's proper deity, which the opposers of that doctrine have never been able, nor will ever be able

to answer." The learned continuators of Pool's Annotations affirm this to be "the fullest place to express the TWO NATURES that are in the person of our Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ, who was *God* as well as *Man*." Storr says of this passage, that it attributes the divine nature to Christ in terms the most unequivocal,* "*Divinam naturam disertissime*

* *Commentationes Theologicæ*, vol. i. p. 224. I the more willingly refer to this observation of Storr, because it affords an opportunity for directing the reader's attention to the valuable essay containing it; in which it is satisfactorily shewn, that the reading of *ος* for *Θεος* in 1 Tim. iii. 16, an alteration which the Unitarians are so extremely anxious to accomplish, would, were it even conceded to them, afford to their cause not the slightest advantage; inasmuch as the meaning of the passage would remain perfectly unaffected by it, and the divinity of Christ would stand upon ground as firm as if the word *Θεος* were the received reading of the text. See *Comm. Theol.* vol. i. p. 219—240.—Cramer, it should be observed, has in a different manner arrived at the same result, by making *θεου ζωντος* the antecedent to *ος*, the intervening words being included in a parenthesis. See Woide's Preface to the Cod. Alex. of the N. T. p. xxxii.

On this text I must notice an observation made by the Editors of the Unitarian Version, that will shew, with what disingenuous vagueness they express themselves on subjects of scripture criticism, and will prove to the unlearned reader, how little confidence he should place in any of their positions. Of the two passages, in 1 Tim. iii. 16, and 1 John, v. 7, they affirm, that they have obtained "a full proof that THESE TEXTS were not to be found in any manuscript existing" (before the fifth century,) "and therefore that THEY are certainly SPURIOUS." *Introd.* p. xviii. Having spoken of these two texts here in precisely the same terms, and pronounced them to be equally spurious, who would not conclude, that, as they have endeavoured to prove the entire passage in John to have been an interpolation, they mean to affirm the same thing of the other, and that consequently no part of it had a place in the genuine text of scripture: whilst, after all, there is nothing more contended for, than the various reading of a single word; and that, a reading, under which the sense of the passage may remain perfectly unaltered? In the more critical part of their work, they endeavour to shew, that the word *ος* should be read for *Θεος*; and in the part

tribuit." Both Grotius and Rosenmuller, it has been remarked before at p. 512 of this volume, observe, upon the words *το κατὰ σαρκά*, that St. Paul meant

where they address themselves to the general reader, they pronounce the *text* to be altogether *spurious*!! How very differently has Dr. Clarke conducted himself upon this subject! Having arrived at the same conclusion with that of the Editors, that the ancient reading was *ος* not *Θεος*, he adds, "But it is not in reality of great importance: for the sense is evident; that that person was manifest in the flesh, whom St. John in the beginning of his Gospel stiles [*Θεος*] God." Clarke's Works, vol. iv. p. 48. The Editors, who in p. 484 have, to procure the authority of this writer's name, quoted him, up to the very sentence that has now been cited, found it convenient to close their quotation at the point where this begins.

It is whimsical enough, that a decided and zealous Unitarian has lately taken up the defence of the received reading *Θεος* in this passage, on the ground both of strict criticism and ancient authorities: and that he does not scruple to charge Griesbach, who proposes the substitution of *ος*, with a corruption of the text, and a total ignorance of the Greek language. He goes so far indeed as to assert of Griesbach, "that implicit confidence is to be reposed neither in his judgment as a critic, nor in his fidelity as an assertor of facts:" and speaking of his elaborate note in support of the reading of *ος*, "engages to shew, that he has proved nothing" (in that) "but his own incompetence as a critic, and his want of fidelity as a collator of the ancient copies." This writer, accordingly proceeds to argue, that neither the genius of the Greek, the sense of the Apostle, nor the authority of the ancient Fathers, will admit any other reading than *Θεος*. See Monthly Repository, vol. ix. p. 120—123. I have mentioned this writer's remarks, more especially for the purpose of reminding the Unitarian Editors, that there are persons, who, although *not* tied down—to a system of Theology, the wretched relic of a dark and barbarous age, on the profession and defence of which all their hopes are built," but even enjoying the pure light of Unitarian illumination, and free as air in the formation of their opinions, are yet of opinion, that, notwithstanding all that has been so laboriously urged against the received reading of the text, *it* and *it* only is the true one: and of reminding them also, that when this is the case, it may be deemed a little too bold, to pronounce on the proposed change, as one so clearly and certainly to be admitted, that the existing text is peremptorily to be rejected as *spurious*.—To

to point out that he here spoke of our Lord, "not according to the *divine* but according to the *human* nature which existed in him." Whitby, in his comment upon this verse, expressly asserts,* that "FROM

pass from the Unitarian Editors to enquirers of a more impartial description, I would recommend it to such as may be desirous of forming a sound judgment on Griesbach's critical investigation of the reading of the text, to consult Dr. Lawrence's learned and valuable Remarks upon Griesbach's Classification, p. 72—84. The observations also in the British Critic (New Series,) vol. i. p. 403—422, deserve to be attended to. See Pearson on the Creed, p. 128, and Whitby in locum. It should be remarked, that they, who oppose the primitive reading of Σ_{100} , are not agreed amongst themselves, what word should be substituted in its place. Griesbach contends for $\sigma\varsigma$; Sir Isacc Newton for α . The persons who follow either confidently, must hold themselves entitled to brand the other with the reading of a "*spurious*" text, in the very same degree, in which the Unitarian Editors are justified in charging it against those who prefer the word Σ_{200} to either. Having mentioned this last distinguished name, I must beg of the reader to attend to the remarks made by Bishop Horsley upon that writer's celebrated treatise on this text, at pp. 532. 549. vol. v. of the Bishop's edition of Newton's works: and especially the remark, at the former of these pages, on Chrysostom's testimony.

* This quotation from Whitby affords an opportunity of remarking on the danger of placing implicit reliance on the generality of writers in their reference to authorities. In a book of some degree of note, Bowyer's Conjectures on the N. T. we find the assertion here made by Whitby, contrasted, as presenting a remarkable opposition, to one made by Mills on the same subject: viz. "that no ONE of all the Catholic Fathers EVER ALLEGED the text before the year 380. Gregory Nyssen first of all." This assertion of Mills the writer quotes from Dr. Clarke, by whom it had been applied, not to this, but to the text 1 Tim. iii. 16, to which it had been applied by Mills. This text in Timothy, however, happening to fall in the same page of Clarke's Works with the observations on Rom. ix. 5; and the note in Clarke, which contains the quotation from Mills, being marked by the same sort of asterisk that had been introduced for quite another object into those observations; the eye of the compiler was wrong directed, whilst his judgment and knowledge were not sufficient to correct the mistake: and,

THE BEGINNING these words have been used by the Fathers, as an argument of Christ's Divinity." And, in truth, there is perhaps no single text in the whole of the N. T. in which the divinity and the two-fold nature of our Lord are laid down more unequivocally, and more indisputably as to the wording of the original, than they are in this. It is therefore not without good reason, that the opposers of our Lord's divinity have always considered this text as presenting the most formidable impediment to the admission of their doctrines; and have accordingly invented various strange devices, and conjectural modifications of the passage, in order if possible to escape from its force. Of all these our Unitarian Editors,* as usual, have availed themselves: but as

therefore, from a mere *deceptio visus*, he has given, as applied by Dr. Clarke to Rom. ix. 5, what that writer had connected with 1 Tim. iii. 16.—See Bowyer's *Conjectures*, p. 260. and Clarke's *Works*, vol. iv. p. 47.

* The manner, in which modern Unitarians abuse the credulity of their readers, cannot be better exemplified than by the remarks which I am about to offer upon their treatment of this text. These remarks, also, at the same time that they will be found to evince the shameful disingenuousness, with which the critics of this school conduct their enquiries, cannot but manifest their extreme anxiety, to avail themselves of every means, whereby they may perplex the meaning, and evade the force, of this important part of Scripture.

The Editors, in the first place, say, "The word 'God' appears to have been wanting in Chrysostom's and some other ancient copies: see Grotius and Griesbach."—Mr. Belsham, again, one of the principal of these Editors, following up the same observation with somewhat more of expansion, says, "Erasmus, Grotius, Dr. Clarke, and others observe, that though the word *God* is found in all our present copies, it was wanting in those of Cyprian, Hilary, Chrysostom and others, and is therefore of *doubtful authority*." (*Calm Inq.* p. 222.) Now, a little attention to the particulars of the above assertions, will, I trust, abundantly prove, that they are, in all their parts, substantially *untrue*. To begin with Mr. Belsham's assertion, that Erasmus, Grotius, and Dr. Clarke affirm, that the word *God* was wanting

if distrusting their sufficiency, they have taken care to seek additional strength from the dexterity of a new translation. The words *το κατὰ σαρκά* would,

in the copies of Cyprian, Hilary, Chrysostom and others: as far as Dr. Clarke is concerned, it is to be observed, that however he may have countenanced the idea that there were copies in which the word was not found, he has never once mentioned the name of Cyprian, or of Hilary, or of Chrysostom in any of his observations upon this text, nor has he specified the name of any ancient whatever in whose copy the word was wanting. See Clarke's Works, vol. iv. pp. 46, 47. 274. 280. 369. 418. 569. If Mr. Belsham can discover, in these, or any other parts, of Dr. Clarke's writings, a contradiction to this assertion, he will produce it.—In the next place as to Grotius; neither does *he* assert that the copies of Cyprian, Hilary and Chrysostom wanted the word *God*. He merely refers to Erasmus, as having said this, but in terms much less explicit than those, in which Mr. Belsham has made the statement for him. Theolog. Works, vol. iii. p. 726. He has indeed asserted for himself, that the word is wanting in the *Syriac Version*, which is possibly alluded to by Mr. Belsham under the word "*others*." But in this Grotius was strangely mistaken, the word being expressly contained in that Version. The whole then of the assertion sustained by the threefold authority of Erasmus, Grotius and Dr. Clarke, we find, subsides into the single authority of Erasmus. But what shall we say, if even Erasmus himself does not make the assertion which Mr. Belsham has ascribed to him?

First, as to Chrysostom, Erasmus does indeed, in one place, say, that this Father, in his Commentary on the passage, supplies no *distinct intimation* that he read the word *for* in his copy: but he at the same time admits, that in Chrysostom's quotation of the text itself, he gives it precisely as it stands in our present received reading of the Greek. Nay more, he allows, that even from the Commentary, it may be collected, that Chrysostom must have read *θεος* in the original: for, after quoting from it at length, he proceeds to express his opinion, that the mention of "THE FATHER" introduced into the exposition, can only be explained on the supposition of its being conveyed, in the context of the Apostle, under the word "GOD." And, again, he remarks, that the clause "*Benedictus in secula*" is referred by Chrysostom to THE SON; which, he observes, could not be done, unless on the supposition, that the clause, "*qui est super omnia Deus*," was also referred to the same. As it is of great consequence, that these remarks of Erasmus should be

in their usual rendering, have been too significant in a passage so strongly marked as the one before us. It was particularly necessary to veil from the

fully understood, I here transcribe his very words. Speaking of Chrysostom's comment upon the place, he says, "Quoniam autem subobscure videtur hunc interpretari locum, commentum quod ad hunc attinet locum, bona fide adscribam, *Nam et adoptio inquit, fuit gratiæ Dei et gloria, et promissiones, et Lex. Quæ omnia considerans animo, ac reputans quantum Deus cum Filio suo studium adhibuerit ad servandos Judæos, vehementer exclamavit, dicens, Qui est benedictus in sæcula, Amen: pro omnibus his gratiam referens ad unigenitum Dei. Quid enim, inquit, si cæteri maledicunt? Nos tamen qui novimus illius arcana, et ineffabilem sapientiam, multamque providentiam, certo scimus illum esse dignum, qui glorificetur, non qui convitiis incessatur, &c.* Primum, hunc locum conjunctim interpretatur de PATRE ET FILIO, cum in contextu nulla sit mentio PATRIS, nisi nomine DEI intelligatur. Deinde cum ait 'gratiarum actionem pro omnibus' quæ commemoravit 'reddi unigenito Dei,' significat hæc verba *benedictus in sæcula* referenda ad FILIUM, cui Judæi maledicebant, quod aliis promisisset, aliis exhiberet promissum. Atqui hæc particula NON POTEST AD CHRISTUM PERTINERE, NISI AD EUNDEM ET ILLA REFERANTUR, *qui est super omnia Deus.*"—Critici Sacri, tom. vii. pp. 2677, 2678.—Now after reading these remarks of Erasmus, although he afterwards says of Chrysostom, "nullam dat significationem se hoc loco legisse DEUS," (by which, consistently with what he had before enforced, he must mean, that the Greek Father had given in his Commentary no distinct declaration that he read the word *God* in his copy,) how is it possible in fairness to pronounce, that Erasmus has affirmed, that the word was wanting in Chrysostom's copy of this Epistle? And more especially, when Erasmus expressly states, that the *text* itself is quoted in the copies of Chrysostom, in the very words of the received text. For, in speaking of the pointing of the verse, as quoted by this Father, at the same time remarking that the exact distribution of the parts of a sentence is often disturbed by the transcribers, he thus expresses himself, "*Eam apud Chrysostomum ita distinctam reperi, ὡν αἱ ἀπαγγελίαι, ὡν οἱ πατέρες, καὶ ἐξ ὧν Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σὰρκα·* hic interposito colo sequitur *ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός·* hinc addita hypostigme sequitur, *εὐλογητός εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας·* quæ distinctio reddit hanc sententiam, *Ille qui est super omnia, nempe Deus, sit benedictus in sæcula.*"—So much for the good faith preserved in speaking of Erasmus's report of Chrysostom!

Next, as to Cyprian and Hilary: Erasmus undoubtedly af-

view, every expression that would direct the mind to a contrast so emphatically exhibiting the two-fold nature of our Lord : and therefore the designa-

firms, that the former, (Adv. Judæos lib. 2. cap. 5.) and the latter, (on psalm 122,) cite this passage, omitting the word *God* in the quotation. But, at the same time, he adds, that this omission seems to have taken place through the carelessness of the transcribers : “*incuria librariorum esse omissum videri :*”—which indeed he might well have added, since, as Beza remarks, the citation is made in both places for the very purpose of proving that the *name* of *God* strictly and properly belongs to Christ :—“*quum utrobique citetur ob hoc ipsum hic locus, ut probetur DEI nomen Christo vere et proprie competere.*” (Beza in locum.)

We now see to what the whole of Erasmus’s authority amounts. So far from having *asserted*, that the word *God* was *wanting* in the copies of Cyprian, Hilary, and Chrysostom ; he admits the actual existence of the word in Chrysostom, and its highly probable existence in the writings of the other two fathers, notwithstanding that in certain parts of their works, and in certain copies of them, there might be an appearance of the omission. Thus then the whole fabric of testimonies concerning these Fathers, which Mr. Belsham has so exultingly erected in the defence of himself and his brother-editors, almost entirely vanishes upon the touch. Erasmus, Grotius and Dr. Clarke. Clarke has never named these fathers upon this text. Grotius, in speaking of them, has only referred to the authority of Erasmus. And Erasmus does not make the assertion that Mr. Belsham has ascribed to him in conjunction with Grotius and Clarke.

But, even granting, that all these writers had, separately and independently, made the assertion, which has been attributed to them, relative to the copies of these ancient Fathers ; yet would it not have been worthy of those, who profess to have TRUTH only for their object, and whose entire endeavours are (as we are told,) devoted to the acquiring a CORRECTED TEXT and an IMPROVED VERSION of the New Testament, to have examined these fathers for themselves ; and not to have taken, upon second hand evidence, a report, which was to shake the authority of the text of Scripture ? Without going even to the works of the Fathers,—and yet to such profound scholars and deep enquirers, as *they* might naturally be supposed, who have undertaken to prove *all* preceding critics and theologians totally mistaken in the true reading and sense of the New Test-

tion of our Lord's Jewish extraction by terms which pointed out a *fleshly origin* in *opposition* to an origin of a *higher* nature, was to give place to one of less

tament, there could have been no great difficulty in doing so,—they might have found in Pearson, or in Whitby, abundant proof, that the word God was *not* wanting in the copies of the Fathers above alluded to: or they might have derived full satisfaction as to the indisputable genuineness of the word, from the negative evidence afforded by Wetstein; whose learning, industry, and good will have never been deficient, in discovering any circumstance that might cast a doubt on the genuineness of those parts of Scripture, that support the proper divinity of Christ; and who, on the present text, has not assigned a single authority, or even conjecture, to disturb its possession of the word *Θεός*. But, as these gentlemen have not thought proper to go back to the authorities themselves, to which they have chosen to refer through the medium of Erasmus, Grotius and Clarke, (with what success we have seen,) I have found it necessary to do this for them: and, having done so, I must take the liberty of saying, that the *three fathers*, whom they have chosen to approach by so circuitous a course, openly announce in the most decisive manner that they *did* read the word God in their copies of this Epistle.

1. St. Cyprian produces this text for the special purpose of proving, *quod Deus Christus*; and reckons it amongst those in which Christ is expressly called God. (Cypr. Opera, Oxon. lib. ii. cap. 5. Adv. Jud. p. 35.) The text is here given precisely according to the present received reading: and, whilst the Editor admits that there were one or two editions in which the word *Deus* was wanting, yet he pronounces (with good reason) the reading to be unquestionable. Pearson specifies the MSS. in which it was *known* to exist: and states other circumstances that place it beyond a doubt. (Expos. of the Creed, pp. 132, 133.)—2. St. Hilary, on the 122d psalm, quotes this passage, *Ex quibus Christus qui est super omnia Deus*, in conjunction with other passages of Scripture, to prove, "*quod Deus nobis unus non solus.*" (Hilar. Opera, p. 393.) And again, in his book De Trinitate he introduces it in a most emphatical manner: "Non ignorat Paulus Christum DEUM, dicens, *Quorum sunt patres, et ex quibus Christus, qui est super omnia Deus:*" adding also what rests the whole force of his argument on the existence of the word "*DEUS,*"—"Non hic creatura in DEUM deputatur, sed creaturarum DEUS est, qui *super omnia DEUS est.*" (Opera, p. 970.)—3. As to St. Chrysostom, we have

forcible application : and the phrase “*by natural descent*” was substituted for the received rendering of the words.

already seen, that in his quotation of the text of the Apostle, he precisely agrees with the reading of the present Greek : so that any pretence derived from his not distinctly pointing out the very word Θεός in his Commentary upon the text is trifling. On the same ground it must be said that ο επι παντων did not exist in his copy ; because whatever reason there is for saying that he passes over the word Θεός applies to the whole clause. On the same ground the words κατα σαρκα after συλησαν in the 3d verse, and οτινες εισιν ισραηλιται in the beginning of the 4th verse, must be pronounced not to have been in his copy, because he does not distinctly notice them in his Commentary, (“nullam dat significationem se hoc loco legisse” hæc verba,) at the same time that, as in the case of the word Θεός, he places them in his quotations of the text. The truth is, that the course of this Father’s reasoning in his Commentary, did not lead him to advert in this place to our Lord’s *divinity*, as may be easily seen by attending to the nature of his exposition. The part, which immediately precedes what has been already quoted at p. 571. is as follows, in the latin translation. “Nam cum dicit, *Quorum adoptio et gloria et legis constitutio et cultus et promissiones* : aliud erit nihil, quam Deum voluisse illos quidem servare, atque hoc patere facit per ea quæ Christus ex illis extitit, per ea quæ patribus promisit. Illi autem a propria ingratitude, atque improbitate beneficentiam repulerunt. Itaque et illa ponit, non quæ illorum laudes sunt, sed quæ Dei donum solummodo arguunt.” Then follows as before given at p. 571. (See Chrys. Comment. vol. ii. p. 229.) If the whole context be considered, it will appear manifestly, that the object of the father, in this part of his exposition, is to mark the great and undeserved goodness of God to the Jews, in accomplishing for them and through them so many good things : and that therefore there was no room for any special observation on the subject of our Lord’s divinity. But at the same time, as we have already seen even in Erasmus’s view of the case, the *bearing* of the word God, and as applied to *Christ*, is decidedly marked in the course of the father’s observations : so much so that there can be no doubt, *even from the Commentary*, that he must have read Θεός in his copy ; independently of the consideration of its actual occurrence in his quotation of the text, and in two other parts of his works which shall be presently pointed out.

But the point, with which we are more immediately concerned, is, not so much the change of version (totally unjustifiable as that is,) as, that the change

I have dwelt the longer upon Chrysostom for the purpose of making a remark on Griesbach's note upon this father's reading of the passage.—“Chrys. ad h. l. post *κατα σαρκα* *præterit verba* *ο αν επι παντων θεος*, et *statim* progreditur ad: *ος εστιν υιο λογητος εις τας αιωνας*, addens: *την υπερ παντων ευχαριστιαν αναφων αυτος* (S. αυτα) *τα μονογενει του θεου*. Sed *in textu et alibi leguntur ista*.” Now, although Griesbach here falls very short of stating the case with its due force, (for so far from an *immediate transition* from the words *κατα σαρκα* to *ος εστιν υιο λογητος* &c. much matter is introduced tending to indicate the existence of the word *θεος* in the original passage of which Chrysostom was treating, as may be seen at pp. 571, and 575,) yet he sufficiently marks by the use of the word “*præterit*,” that he meant to represent Chrysostom, as *passing over, in this place, the consideration of* the words *ο αν επι παντων θεος*, not that they were omitted in his copy; for he immediately subjoins, “*in textu et alibi leguntur*”; announcing, that this father, although he had not specially noticed the words in his Comment, had yet in his reciting of the *text* of the Apostle, and in *other places*, given them exactly as they stand in our received text. It has been already seen, that, in *quoting the text* of the Apostle, Chrysostom agrees exactly with the present reading. We shall now see, how far Griesbach was justified in asserting the same of *other places* of this father's writings, “*alibi*.” In the fifth Homily, *De incomprehensib. Dei natura contra Αναρκειους* (Opera, vol. i. p. 382.) we find the whole passage, exactly as it is now given in the text of Griesbach, applied to prove the divinity of Christ. And again in the third Homily *in cap. 1. Evang. Joh.* (Comm. vol. ii. p. 36.) we have the words, *ο αν επι παντων θεος* combined with the texts, Tit. ii. 13, Philipp. ii. 6, and Rom. i. 7, to constitute a proof, that the word *Θεος* is frequently applied to Christ *without the article*; and that, consequently, no difference in deity, is intended to be marked in Scripture, between the Father and the Son. Thus, then, Chrysostom becomes a decisive witness for the existence of the word *God*, in the copies of this Epistle which he used: and so, in truth, Griesbach represents him. Yet the Editors of the Unitarian N. T. would *reject* this word on the authority of Chrysostom, and on Griesbach's representation of that authority!—“The word ‘God’ appears to have been wanting in Chrysostom's and some other ancient copies. See Grotius and Griesbach.” Of Grotius we have already spoken. The reader may now judge of Griesbach.—Such is the abuse of au-

should have been made *without notice*: a change, to which the Editors attach so high a value; and which, with the Archbishop's version lying before them,

thorities exercised by Unitarian writers, without shame or scruple: and this too, not merely in the ardour of controversial contest, but with the cool and deliberate purpose of falsifying the word of God. Such are the means, by which scanty learning, and dishonest criticism, jointly endeavour, under the pretence of obtaining a *corrected text* and an *improved version*, to corrupt the original, and to pervert the translation, of all those parts of the N. T. in which the characteristic doctrines of Christianity are involved.

Now, what will the reader say, when he is informed, that the word "*God*" in this text, the authority of which it has been thus attempted to shake under the sound of the names of Erasmus, Grotius, Dr. Clarke, Griesbach, ("AND OTHERS,") St. Cyprian, St. Hilary, St. Chrysostom, ("AND OTHERS,") is found in *every known manuscript* of this Epistle, in *every ancient version extant*, and (in direct opposition to all that has been asserted by Mr. Belsham and his brother Editors, and notwithstanding the trifling additional remark in Griesbach of "*Leo SEMEL et Ephr. ap. Jackson,*") in EVERY FATHER who has had occasion to cite the passage: so that in truth, there can scarcely be instanced a text in the N. T. in which *all* the ancient authorities more satisfactorily agree. So circumstanced is that reading of the text, which Mr. Belsham and his brother Editors require us to consider as "of doubtful authority." For the numerous instances of the citation of this verse by the Fathers, I refer the reader to Whitby in loc. and to Bull. Opera, pp. 72, 73, and especially to pp. 249, 250, for the exposure of Erasmus's error concerning *Origen*.

But to follow these Unitarian critics to another point. Having thus, as we have seen, flung doubts upon the existence of the word *God* in the original; but feeling, at the same time, (with good reason,) some misgivings as to their reception; the next step taken by them, is an endeavour to prevent the application of the word to Christ; whereby the end proposed would be equally attained as by its rejection from the text. Accordingly, the propriety of a new punctuation is suggested, by which the verse may be separated into two distinct sentences: thus, "Of whom by natural descent of Christ came. God who is over all be blessed for ever." In support of this interpretation, the principal vindicator of the Version, deals out, as usual, a string of names: and amongst these he introduces the name of Locke,

which they professed to follow, could not have been made without the fullest deliberation and design. This must be evident to every one who considers not

a name, which, (as we have already noticed,) the Unitarians are particularly ambitious to press into the service, in order to give countenance to a pretence, which is directly contradictory to the known truth, (see pp. 266, 267 of this vol.) that Locke was a *Socinian*. Now, as we saw Cyprian, Hilary, and Chrysostom, misrepresented in the last clause, so we shall find Locke most flagrantly belied in this. For, so far is Locke from placing a full stop after the word *σαρκι*, and reading (as it is here asserted,) "God who is over all be blessed for ever," he separates, by a point introduced after *παντων*, the clause, "he who is over all," from the words that follow, and reads in a distinct member, "God be blessed for ever." Mr. Belsham's aversion to the trouble of consulting the original authorities supplies no apology for his misrepresentation of Locke in this place: because, even without referring to Locke himself he might have met with his division of the verse in most of the recent publications that treat of this text; and particularly in the writings of those whom his Unitarian predilections most dispose him to consult. He might have met with it in Wetstein's note, "Vel ut J. Lockius: *Qui Christus est super omnia: Deus sit benedictus!*"—He might have met with it in the Unitarian's Remarks on the Scriptural confutation of Mr. Burgh. Or he might have met with it in his friend Dr. Carpenter's Book. Indeed it is a point so notorious, that it is scarcely possible to give Mr. Belsham credit for ignorance upon the subject.

Now, the reader will easily perceive the great difference that exists between the reading adopted by Mr. Belsham and his brother Editors, and that proposed by Mr. Locke, which, though it agrees with the former, in concluding the sentence with a doxology in praise of the Father, yet admits the exalted dignity and extended dominion of our Lord, expressed by the words, "*who is over all;*" and which, in the opinion of Erasmus, treating of this very distribution of the sentence, attributes *divinity* to Christ as forcibly as the word "God" could. "*Ex quibus Christus juxta carnem, qui Christus est super omnia: sive, qui erat super omnia. Ne quis enim suspicaretur dignitatem imminutam per assumptam hominis naturam, respiciens ad Divinitatem adjecit, qui est super omnia. Hæc distinctio tribuit Divinitatem Christo, quod nihil est super omnia præter UNUM DEUM.*" (Crit. Sac. pp. 2676. 2677.) It will now be difficult to appreciate the dependence to be placed on the assertions of

merely the wideness of the departure from the Archbishop's translation, "*as concerning the flesh:*" but also the constraining force which the Archbish-

a writer who claims Locke as a supporter of the former reading, and thereby associates him as an auxiliary in the Unitarian interpretation of the sentence throughout. In truth, Mr. Locke not only differs from the Unitarian Editors, in his distribution of the sentence, which is (as far as they are concerned) a vital variation: but he completely overturns their whole system by the sense which he gives to the sentence at large; rendering *το κατὰ σαρκος*, *as to his FLESHLY EXTRACTION;*" which "FLESHLY EXTRACTION" he contrasts (as we have already seen at p. 512, in his observations on Rom. i. 3) with the "DIVINE EXTRACTION *immediately from God;*" and which (as we have also seen) he more fully explains by paraphrasing the words *as to the flesh* thus: "i. e. as to the *body which he took in the womb of the blessed virgin his mother.*" Such is the support which Mr. Locke contributes to these writers, who are perpetually sounding his name, as one of the most decided advocates of their system: and such is the mode in which these writers fabricate support to their cause.

Mr. Locke's interpretation, however, and every other which converts the concluding clause into a doxology to the Father, is, as has been unanswerably shown, especially by Dr. Middleton, altogether inadmissible. Dr. Carpenter, upon the whole of this subject, has acted with more fairness than Mr. Belsham. He has not only not confounded Mr. Locke's interpretation of the passage with that of the Unitarian Version; but he has admitted Dr. Middleton's arguments into consideration, and has even acknowledged them to "*have some weight*" so far as they apply to Mr. Locke's view of the passage, at the same time that he denies that they possess any force as opposed to the interpretation of it by the Unitarians. But let Dr. Carpenter labour to varnish the matter as he may, the objections urged by Dr. Middleton, and since enforced by Mr. Veysie and Dr. Nares, against *both* the modes of interpretation, that of the Unitarians and that of Mr. Locke, against all in short that would break the concluding part of the verse into a separate sentence in the form of a doxology, are, and must be allowed by every Greek scholar to be, incontrovertible. Dr. Whitby had before abundantly shewn, that such a distribution and punctuation of the sentence as these interpretations demanded, could not be defended on any just principles of criticism. That the reasoning of Whitby or Middleton should be noticed by Mr. Belsham, was not

op exerts upon the reader's attention, by the still more emphatical language of the note upon these words—"of whom *as to his* HUMAN *lineage* Christ is

indeed to be expected. It would have been a departure from the established usage of that writer, and most of his associates, to bestow consideration upon the arguments of any, who oppose the tenets and dogmas of their party. But surely the observations of Mr. Wakefield might have been taken into account. Mr. Wakefield, who is so favourite an authority with Unitarians on almost all occasions; whose Version of the N. T. the Editors of the present one had for some time anxiously in contemplation for the basis of their own:—his judgment upon this subject cannot surely be suspected of any orthodox bias. And, if even this writer, (the only Greek scholar, whatever may have been the degree of his pretensions, that the English Unitarians have to boast of,) if even he, with all his earnest desire to embrace whatever might favour the Unitarian cause, was not able to digest the harsh and unnatural construction adopted by the Editors in this place, what judgment ought (I will not say a critic and a scholar, because such a man would and ought to judge for himself, but) even Mr. Belsham's favourite arbiter in Scripture criticism, the man of merely "sound understanding and honest mind," what judgment ought he to form upon the subject? Mr. Wakefield's observations I shall give in his own words: "Some critics have proposed to distinguish the verse in the following manner: *Of whom were the Fathers, of whom was the Christ according to the flesh. God, who is over all, be blessed for evermore! Amen. Or thus: Of whom were the Fathers, of whom was the Christ according to the flesh, who is over all. God be blessed for evermore! Amen.* Both these constructions, though the original will certainly admit them, appear so awkward, so abrupt, so incoherent, that it must be confessed, I never yet could bring myself to relish them in the least degree. There seems to be no reason from the spirit of the context, for such an instantaneous and solemn conversion from the main subject to the Deity; nor do I believe, that a parallel instance of so disjointed an address can be produced from the whole Bible." (See Wakefield's Inquiry into the Opinions, &c. vol. i. pp. 162, 163.) Rosenmuller, also, the Unitarians are disposed to regard as a respectable and unbiassed Commentator. What does he say on this point? "Interpretatio ea, qua hæc verba ad PATREM referuntur, nec contextui, nec regulis Grammaticis est conveniens. Quod si enim vera esset, Paulus non ο ων εστι παντων θεος, sed potius ο θεος ο ων εστι παντων scripturus fuisset, ut 2

descended," &c. It is also to be observed, that not only have the Editors made this remarkable change, without the slightest notice of the Archbishop's

Cor. xi. 31. Istud vero *ο ον*, quod h. l. legimus, positum est pro *ος εστι*, ut Jo. i. 18, et iii. 13. ideoque *ad Christum pertinet*, de quo antea dixerat, eum *κατα σαρκα* e Judæis ortum esse; jam vero, ne hic subsistant Christiani ex Judæis, *divinam Messie majestatem* addita doxologia celebrat." (Schol. in Nov. Test. tom. iii. p. 482.)—But what says the Father of Socinianism himself? Whilst labouring with all his might to prevent this passage from establishing the proper deity of Christ, he is not only obliged to confess, that the ancient authorities are in favour of the commonly received distribution and construction of the sentence; but he is also forced to admit, that the *position* of *ευλογητος* is inconsistent with that punctuation which the Unitarian rendering requires. (Socin. Opera, Respons. ad Vujek, tom. ii. pp. 582. 600.) This, which is one of the chief arguments employed by Whitby and Middleton, seems also not to have been pressed upon Socinus by his opponents, but rather to have originated with himself, as naturally growing out of the genius of the Greek and the phraseology of the N. T.: and so overbearing did he feel the force of its application, that he was compelled by it to concede, that the concluding words of the verse related to Christ; although, to prevent the conclusion which hence resulted in favour of our Lord's divinity, he was driven to the extravagant assertion, that as Christ was not simply called *God*, but *God over all*, this could not interfere with his proper humanity, but on the contrary admitted with regard to him the most appropriate application:—an assertion so extravagant, that Mr. Belsham exclaims against it with the greatest vehemence, in his note p. 224, where he ascribes it to Slichtingius only. He was not perhaps aware, that this is a position maintained by *all* the old Socinian writers, who have treated of this verse. But it should be recollected, that it has been maintained by them, *because* they could not embrace that other extravagance which the modern Socinians so strongly recommend. *They* studied and knew the original somewhat better than those who have followed them: and between the violation of the principles of the language required by the modern interpretation of the text, and the extravagance of the gloss upon the true translation demanded by their own, they felt there was no difficulty of choice. They were in short incapable of such *criticism* as is familiar with modern Unitarians; and therefore they found it impossible to deny, (however they might endeavour to explain

rendering either in the text or note of his Version; but that they have done so, although they have themselves introduced a long note upon the pas-

it,) that Christ is here pronounced to be *God over all*, and *blessed for evermore*. Crellius and Slichtingius are fully as decided upon this point as Socinus: and the latter specially adds, that from this passage of St. Paul we learn, that praises, and benedictions, and divine worship are to be offered to Christ. See Crell. Opera, tom. i. (Resp. ad Grot.) p. 230. (Ethic. Christ.) p. 348. tom. ii. p. 224. in locum. also Slichting. Comment. Posth. tom. i. p. 254.

I have noticed two attempts of the Calm Inquirer, and his brother Editors, to disturb the obvious and commonly received reading and interpretation of the passage in question. We come now to a third view of the case which they seem to consider preferable to every other: and which, strange to say, requires the dereliction of the very points which it had before been deemed necessary to maintain; demanding for its admissibility the retaining of *Θεός* in the text; and rejecting all idea of the doxology, which had been so eagerly contended for, and of the peculiar punctuation on which that doxology was founded. This "most happy and plausible conjecture," which is taken from the old Socinian writer Slichtingius, consists, Mr. Belsham informs us, in "the transposition of a single letter, *ων ο*, for *ο ων*, which gives a new and beautiful turn to the whole sentence, viz. 'Of whom is the adoption,—of whom are the fathers,—of whom is the Messiah,—OF WHOM is God over all blessed for ever.' Thus the climax rises gradually and finishes where it ought." (Calm. Inq. p. 223.) Now, in the first place, it is to be observed, that Mr. Belsham has here produced, as from Slichtingius, a piece of criticism, which in the exact form, in which he has presented it, neither Slichtingius, nor any critic acquainted with the Greek language, has, or could have given it. Mr. Belsham has put *ων ο* instead of *ο ων*, and thinks, that, in doing so, he has substituted the genitive plural of the relative for the participle present of the verb substantive; whereas, in truth, no participle appears in his reading of the passage at all. The old Socinian understood the language too well to have been guilty of such a blunder. His was not a mere change of the position of letters, but a transposition of the words, modified of course with their due accompaniments; a change of *ο ων* into *ων ο*; giving, as was intended, a real change of the participle into the genitive plural of the relative. It cannot be here pretended, that the error is a mere mistake of the printer in the *spirits at-*

sage, and in this note remark upon their variation from the Archbishop in the *remaining* part of the text:—"the common version here adopted by Dr.

tached to the words; for Mr. Belsham himself takes care to inform us, that the *only change* to be made, is the "transposition of a SINGLE LETTER," expressly excluding the idea of any other alteration whatsoever, and agreeably to this exhibiting none other in his page. Other writers, indeed, may have spoken generally of transposing the two *words*; that of course implying the entire modification of the words, and consequently including all their attendant characters: but, I will venture to say, that Mr. Belsham has the sole credit of discovering, that "the transposition of a *single letter*" is the *only change* requisite to give that "new and beautiful turn to the whole sentence," of which he speaks. If it be said, that, although we, at this day, employ accents and spirits in our notation of the Greek, yet, the ancient Greek MSS. being written without them, the transposition of a single letter would, in *them*, produce the change, which Mr. Belsham describes:—let it be remembered, that this makes no difference in the case so far as Mr. Belsham is concerned; inasmuch as it is not upon *them* he builds his remark: it is to the Greek character in its *present* state he applies his observation; pronouncing upon *that* the sufficiency of the transposition of a single letter for the change which he requires; and exemplifying his assertion by an adjustment of the spiritual marks, such as to cause no change *but* "the transposition of a single letter:" and consequently proving to the world, how very imperfectly he is acquainted, with even the lowest rudiments of the language, on which he ventures to comment.—But, to pass from these modern blunders to the ancient MSS. it should be recollected, that as *no one* manuscript, nor *any single* version or father, gives the sentence at this day with the reading that has been here suggested; the transposition, if it took place at all, must have been of a very early date, of a date almost as early as that of the epistle itself. Now, will any person, conversant with the history of the Greek language, undertake to affirm, that, at so remote a period, the change, which has been here spoken of, could have been effected by "the transposition of a single letter?" Can any one acquainted with the ancient Greek inscriptions venture to assert that the Greek aspirate H had ceased to be employed in the age in which St. Paul's Epistle was written. And if on the contrary there be good reason to think that it had not, will he deem that change so likely, which, so far from consisting in the mere transposition

Newcome is, *who is over all, God blessed forever.*" And here they stop as to the matter of variation, giving the reader to understand that they have laid

of a letter would demand the alteration of the word **HWNHO** into **HOWN?**

But, not only have we to urge against the proposed reading the admitted fact that no vestige of such a reading has been discovered in *any one* of all the MSS. Versions, and quotations that have come down to our times; but we have also to urge against it, as has been clearly and ably shewn by Dr. Middleton, that it would both give a false Greek and a direct contradiction to St. Paul's own reasoning. (See Middleton on the Greek Article, p. 456.) But for the Critics with whom I am concerned, reasonings of this description are not requisite. Their own shewing generally suffices to overturn their argument. The single reason, advanced by Mr. Belsham and his brother Editors, in favour of the proposed conjectural reading, is, that the climax is by this regularly carried on and fully completed. "*Ὦν ἡ υἱοθεσία, Ὦν οἱ πατέρες, Ὦν Χριστός, Ὦν ὁ Θεός*, of whom was the adoption, of whom were the fathers, of whom was Christ, of whom was God who is over all." (Imp. Vers. in loc. and Calm Inq. p. 223.) Now, it happens unfortunately for the smoothness and continuity of the climax, that the form of expression is not carried on as it is here given, the words not being *Ὦν Χριστός* but *Ἐξ Ὦν Χριστός*, which at once breaks the continuity, as marking the *extraction* of Christ, and therefore requiring in the English the force of the *derivative*, not as in the other clauses that of the mere *possessive*. Mr. Belsham, and his brother Editors, have availed themselves of the ambiguity of the phrase "OF WHOM," to give an *appearance* of sameness to the several clauses, whilst in reality they differ: and thus they make out their climax by giving first a false text, and then an equivocating translation. So much for this "new and beautiful turn," bestowed upon the sentence before us, by a conjecture, which has not a single manuscript, or version, or authority of any kind to sustain it; which makes St. Paul contradict himself; which utters false Greek; and which does not accomplish the only point that is brought forward to recommend it, the continuing and completing of a climax.

That Socinians, whose minds are antecedently satisfied as to what Scripture ought to mean, should eagerly catch at this, or any other, conjecture, that promises the semblance of support to their system, is not to be wondered at: but it certainly is just matter of surprise and concern, that Griesbach should have con-

before him the *whole* of their departure from the *Primate*, whilst they have touched only on that part for which they think they have some shew of

descended to mix with the grave authorities that are to substantiate the true text of Scripture, a conjecture so trifling, so contemptible, so objectionable, and so unauthorized. It has been already observed that this Critic, although not intending himself to shake the authenticity of the word *Θεός* in this text, had yet by an injudicious and perplexed mode of displaying authorities which do not in reality make against the word, afforded to those who only sought some pretext for its rejection, a colour for using the authority of his name. But I have farther to add concerning the same distinguished Critic, in this place, in point of accuracy, that he has been guilty of an inadvertency, here, in omitting to observe, that the Cod. Alex. wants all that follows in the fourth verse, after the word *ισραηλῖταις*, or, as this MS. reads, the word *ισραηλιταις*.

Enough has been offered, in this note, to shew, that the Unitarian Editors have strained every nerve, for the withdrawing of this important text, from the list of those, that go to support the *divinity*, and to establish the *two distinct natures*, of Christ. Enough also has been offered to make it evident that all the objections and difficulties which they have laboured to throw in the way of its just application, only tend to prove the degree to which they are deficient, in the candour, and the learning, requisite for a sound exposition of Scripture. And enough surely has been offered to satisfy the reader, that, upon the accuracy of their quotations, and their reports of ancient authorities, no reliance whatever is to be placed.—Indeed, to make the true nature and value of the criticisms of these writers fully understood, it might have been sufficient to observe, that the construction and sense of the passage which they have adopted, depends entirely upon the genuineness of the very word *Θεός*, which they have taken so much pains to prove to be “of dubious authority;” and that the conjectural interpretation, which they seem (at least Mr. Belsham does) to admire above every other, requires, not only that the word *God* should be received as indisputably genuine, but that the punctuation which they reject should be retained as the true one. Thus, truth, in the hands of these critics, is made to war with itself. The same word is both spurious and genuine, the same punctuation correct and erroneous, according as each supposition ministers to a Socinian interpretation of the Scriptures; according as each is found conformable to that paramount Unitarian test, by which the

authority, and on which accordingly they dwell at length; but on the part, which is purely and exclusively their own, for which they can produce no

modern Socinians determine without hesitation upon every question affecting the sense of the sacred text.

As to the direct arguments, in favour of the commonly received construction and application of the passage in question; these have been so satisfactorily stated, by Whitby, and various other distinguished Commentators, and have recently been so fully and ably vindicated, by Dr. Middleton and Dr. Nares, against all the modern attempts to subvert them, that it is altogether unnecessary (did it even fall within my plan) to present them to the reader.—In addition to the well known treatises of Dr. Middleton, and Dr. Nares, I would recommend to the reader's attention, on the subject of this note, Mr. Veysie's Defence of the Preservative (p. 107—112.) Burgh's Inquiry (p. 23—32.) Simpson's Plea (pp. 241—243. 255.) and Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy (pp. 69—72. 419. 420.) This last writer, who has treated many important points of this controversy with great ability, has made an observation particularly deserving of notice on the conjectural alteration of *ο αυ*, into *ων ο* already treated of at p. 585, &c.—The conjunction *και*, he says, in the enumeration of the series of particulars, must connect itself with the last; and therefore were there no other argument against the proposed alteration than this, that *και* must become thereby connected, not with the last, but with an intermediate, article of the series, he thinks, and justly, it would be decisive. The alteration, therefore, if it were admitted, must be not merely of *ο αυ* into *ων ο*, but into *και ων ο*, the *και* being transferred from the preceding clause, *και εξ ων ο Χριστος*. Indeed the Editors themselves were so sensible that the copulative could not stand where it does, on admitting the proposed transposition, that they have taken care to strike it out of the passage altogether; as may be seen in their mode of adjusting the clauses of the sentence, as it has been stated at page 587. Thus, to the violence of the transposition, and the exclusion of the preposition *εξ*, we have now to add their exclusion of the conjunction *και*: so that before we can allow to the Editors the benefit of the "new and beautiful turn" that they conceive to be given to the sentence by the transposition of the words, they must not only transpose the words, but they must strike the two words *και* and *εξ* entirely out of the text.

In this note, we have seen several distinguished names referred to by the Unitarians: some of whom, especially Grotius and

authority whatever, and which goes to the very essence of the Socinian controversy, they preserve a perfect silence.—On this it must be unnecessary to add any farther observations. Whether the Editors have, on this important part of Scripture, acted with good faith by their professed model, I leave to the reader to judge for himself. I have not noticed here their unacknowledged departure from the Primate, (and also from Griesbach) in suppressing the concluding word “*Amen*,” as being a matter of inferior consideration, farther than as it tends to give an additional instance of their failure in that *faithful adherence* to the Primate’s Version, (and also to Griesbach’s text,) of which they so much boast.

In the instance of Number V. (see page 244. v. ii.)

Locke, they are willing on many occasions to claim as auxiliaries to their cause. How unfounded this claim is with respect to Locke, has been already noticed ; and occasion may be taken again to advert to it. As for Grotius, although his exposition of many passages of Scripture is (as I have already remarked elsewhere) so favourable to the general principles of Socinianism, that some have thought the title of Socinian not altogether inapplicable to him ; yet, the various instances of his direct assertion of the divinity of Christ throughout his Commentary, together with his celebrated defence of the doctrine of *Christ’s satisfaction* against the attacks of Socinus, must surely place him beyond the range of those whom the Unitarians have any reasonable pretence for pressing within their ranks. So many of the instances alluded to have been detailed by the Bishop of St. David’s in his Treatise on The Bible, &c. (see especially pp. 79. 85—87.) that I shall only add to what is there advanced, a single quotation from the conclusion of the work *De Satisfactione Christi*. Speaking of the Socinian endeavours to degrade the nature of Christ, he uses the following language. “*Sed profecto minime mirum est, si qui Christo gloriam naturalem, hoc est veri nominis deitatem, sustulerunt, iidem et officia ipsius immittunt, et beneficia ipsius præcipua recusant agnoscere. TIBI, DOMINE JESU, UT VERO DEO, ut vero Redemptori, ut vero Sacerdoti, ut vero pro peccatis victimæ, cum PATRE ET SPIRITU, ENG TECUM DEO, SIT HONOS ET GLORIA.*”

we find, in a passage directly and forcibly expressing the PRE-EXISTENCE of our Lord, not only a departure from the Primate, in the very terms which convey that important doctrine; but a substitution of others, that completely divest the passage of any such signification. We find also, a note of some length, enlarging upon and confirming the rendering adopted by the Imp. Vers. and yet, throughout the entire of it, not the most remote hint conveyed of any variance from the Primate's translation: and this too, whilst the Primate himself has introduced a note enforcing more strongly the application of the text to the PRE-EXISTENCE. The Primate renders, "*though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor;*" and subjoins in the note, "RICH—in the glories of his divine nature"—"POOR—by taking on him human nature, and appearing even in a humble state of life:" quoting, at the same time, as a parallel explanation, the celebrated text of Philipp. ii. 6, &c. The Imp. Vers. on the other hand, renders the passage, "*while he was rich, yet for your sakes he lived in poverty:*" and then in the note affirms, that "the construction requires it to be understood, not of a passage from a preceding state of wealth to a succeeding state of poverty, but of two cotemporary states:—he was rich and poor at the same time:" and from this view of the subject, proceeds to establish the *impossibility* of any reference to the *pre-existence* of Christ. In other words, the I. V. translates in a sense directly opposite to that of the Primate; labours to enforce the necessity of this sense, in a note which is carried to considerable extent, and in which Wakefield, Grotius, and other authorities are introduced; does this, in contradiction not only to the Primate's rendering, but to his illustration and support of that rendering in strong and emphatical terms in *his* note, which directly chal-

lenged their attention: all this too, on a point of *vital import** in the *Unitarian* scheme; and yet, in no place, is there the slightest glance at this gross

* Mr. Belsham, indeed, in his *Calm Inquiry*, pleasantly enough wishes to persuade us, that, if our heads were not already stuffed with the notion of the pre-existence of Christ, we never could “*dream of finding it in this text.*” He is so candid as to admit, that it might furnish perhaps “a graceful allusion;” but he can never allow it to be alleged as “a proof.” And why? Because “when it is said of *any man*, that *though he is rich he spends nothing*,” no one “in his senses infers from it, that he *existed before he was born.*” Upon this principle,” he adds, “EVERY MISER WOULD HAVE A CLAIM TO PRE-EXISTENCE.”—This is the remark of a *Calm Inquirer*. He tells us, that unless we are dreaming, we must admit, that the text means nothing more than to inform us of “A MAN, WHO THOUGH HE WAS RICH SPENT NOTHING,” of a mere “MISER:” and then, when we have, by this admission, proved ourselves to be wide awake, he will satisfy us, that it has no relation to PRE-EXISTENCE. But, in the mean time, what has become of the “*graceful allusion?*” The elegance and good taste of the *Calm Inquirer*’s representation of the “MISER,” may indeed, have conferred upon the subject a *grace*: but the *allusion* to pre-existence, even with our eyes perfectly open, we are no longer able to discover. Yet, strange to say, there are persons, who have not been looked upon as actual dreamers, although their “judgment” is (of course) held comparatively cheap by the *Calm Inquirer*, who have, notwithstanding, as he himself informs us, “held up this text as a *decisive proof* of this doctrine” of pre-existence. He was *rich*—“rich,” says Dr. Doddridge, ‘in the glories of the heavenly world, and in supreme dominion and authority there, yet for your sakes he became poor.’—‘Rich,’ says Archbishop Newcome, ‘in the glories of the divine nature, he became poor by taking on him human nature, and appearing even in a humble state of life.’—‘Rich,’ says Dr. Harwood, ‘in his pre-existent state, in glory, honour, and happiness, with a greatness of soul which can never be sufficiently extolled, he abdicated all this, and became poor. The apostle’s argument upon this scheme only is cogent, apposite, and very elegant and persuasive. To interpret this of our Lord being rich in miracles, and becoming poor in them at his crucifixion, is such a jejune and forced criticism, as I imagine was never used to explain any author.’” (*Calm Inq.* pp. 122, 123.) All this, however, in the view of the *Calm Inquirer*, is downright nonsense, mere dreaming: since “EVERY

departure, or the name of the Archbishop once alluded to; notwithstanding the most solemn assurances to the public, first given by the Editors col-

MISER would have a claim to *pre-existence*," on the principle that would infer pre-existence from *this* text. It may seem odd, that Dr. Carpenter should carry himself more *calmly* upon this subject than the CALM Inquirer. Yet so it is. For, although the friend and coadjutor of Mr. Belsham, and equally anxious with him to withdraw this text from the support of the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence, he yet admits, without casting any imputation of *dreaming*, &c. "that it *may* be translated as in the public version, and that it *may* be interpreted in reference to a *pre-existent-state*:" and all he contends for is, that his own translations (which, by the bye, do not go to the length of that in the Imp. Vers.) "equally well suit the original." (Unit. the Doct. p. 231.) Dr. Carpenter, it is plain, saw a little more in this text, than the allusion to a person, who, "though he was rich spent nothing;" or, in other words, to one who was a mere "MISER."—But, in truth, it must in justice be said of this last mentioned writer, that, although an equally staunch friend to the cause of Unitarianism with Mr. Belsham, he does not appear to be exactly of the same class, in the characters of temper, discretion and decorum.

We need not be surprised, that Mr. Belsham makes so light of the passage before us, as affecting the argument for our Lord's pre-existence. It is a *rule* with this writer, to treat in like manner, the several passages that are adduced in support of that doctrine. Texts of scripture, which do not merely announce, but proclaim the doctrine, in words so plain and strong, that language can supply none more unequivocal and forcible, are at once dismissed, (in the appearance of perfect composure and gravity,) either as having no bearing upon the question, or as giving support to the Unitarian scheme of the proper humanity of Christ. Thus, for example, when, in John xvii. 5. our Lord, addressing himself to the Father, prays to be glorified with him, *with that glory which he had with the Father before the world was*; Mr. Belsham calmly informs us, that this, when well considered, "contains *no proof* of Christ's *pre-existence*, but is *perfectly compatible with his proper humanity*." (Calm Inq. p. 114.)—Again, when in Coloss. i. 17, St. Paul informs us concerning Christ, that "He is before all things;" Mr. Belsham very composedly tells us, that "*no argument* for the pre-existence of Christ can be drawn from *this* ambiguous text." (Calm Inq. p. 148.) Again, when in Philipp. ii. 6. &c.

lectively, and since peremptorily repeated by their Calm Inquirer, and others of them, individually, that, in *every* instance of deviation from the Archbishop's

we are assured by the Apostle, that Christ, *being in the form of God, had made himself of no reputation, and was made in the likeness of men*; the Calm Inquirer, without the slightest discomposure of *his* gravity, (*risum teneatis* may however not be an inexpedient hint to the reader,) assures us in return, that if *this* text "be not *decisive in favour of the doctrine*" (of "the PROPER HUMANITY of Jesus Christ,") it "may *at least* be regarded as *neutral*:" that, in short, "*it is one of those passages, of which NO USE can be made in deciding the controversy.*" (Calm Inq. p. 145.)—Mr. Belsham had, however nearly settled the whole question already. For, having disposed of the celebrated passage (John viii. 58.) *πριν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι ἦν αὐτός*, by asserting that the words *I am*, must mean, *I was*; and by adducing in his support the authority of a number of "able and learned critics and divines," (he might with *equal truth* have added, most impartial and unprejudiced on the Unitarian question,) Dr. Lardner, Mr. Cardale, Mr. Lindsey, Dr. Priestley, Mr. Wakefield, and Mr. Simpson, he calmly adds, (p. 102.) that this nearly decides the whole controversy, "for if this declaration does not establish the pre-existence of Christ, no other passage can." Undoubtedly: or rather he might have said, *no language* can. For with this, of course, he sweeps away at once every passage, in which Christ is represented as existing previously to his appearance upon earth: since, like this, all these can only relate to an *existence in the divine purpose*: (p. 103.) and therefore the pre-existence of our Lord in the usual sense of the word, is a matter that language *cannot* express. (See p. 53—56. vol. i. of this work.) I need not go farther. It is manifest, that be the force of expression in the sacred writers what it may, there is a strength of front which far exceeds it.

But again, in matter even of taste and illustration, no less than in that of reasoning and argument, there is a spirit of paradox, that seems to exercise a perverse ascendancy over the mind of the Unitarian. Otherwise, surely, it never could have occurred to Mr. Belsham, in his endeavour to enforce the position, that the texts supporting the pre-existence and divinity of our Lord, are "*few in number*," to compare them to "THE STARS IN THE FIRMAMENT." They are, indeed, it must be confessed, "like the Stars in the firmament," numerous and bright. They are as stars set in the firmament of the Heaven, to declare the Majesty of Him who dwells there, and the glory of that Great Be-

rendering, acknowledgment is *openly made* in the notes.

Well, but, perhaps, this is another instance of

ing whose handiwork those stars are proclaimed to be. Mr. Belsham, it is true, intends this comparison, as he informs us, for a very different purpose; and refers to *the Stars*, merely as dazzling the eyes of the spectator, and exciting "the ideas of *number* and *magnitude* far beyond the *reality*." (Calm. Inq. p. 20.) Surely, it was enough for this gentleman to have blundered as a Rhetorician, and not to have blundered also as an Astronomer. What "*reality*" does the Calm Inquirer mean? Does he mean by it the *actual state* of the Stars? It is strange indeed, if so learned an astronomer does not know, that their *real magnitudes* are millions of times greater than those which they present to our view; and that their *actual number* also we have good reason to believe to be vastly greater than what the eye is able to discern. Or, does he mean by "*the reality*," the *appearances* which they offer to the corrected vision of the Astronomer aided by the telescope? This seems an odd application of the word "*reality*." But, here again, he ought to know, that whilst the *apparent magnitudes* are diminished by the removal of the irradiation, the number of the visible stars is prodigiously encreased; the telescope calling into apparent existence what was undiscoverable to the naked eye. So that, when this scientific critic speaks of "the eye of reason aided by philosophy," *reducing* both the number and magnitude of those heavenly bodies to their juster standard, he is every way unfortunate. The *eye* of the ASTRONOMER enables him to add to their *number*; and his *philosophy*, to encrease their *magnitude*; and both to a degree which the uninformed cannot readily believe.—And here also, the parallel holds good. For, to the eye of a well informed understanding, aided by just principles of criticism, and a sound knowledge of the original language of the N. T; the texts, which bespeak the pre-existence and divinity of our Lord, encrease upon the view in number and in strength, to a prodigious amount. Their individual force, and collective bearings, become infinitely more striking and demonstrative. And, when duly grouped together, like the constellations into which the Astronomer forms his classes, they spread a brightness and illumination over the face of the Scriptures, like that which these luminaries shed over the firmament of the heavens. I agree then with Mr. Belsham as to his *parallel*. The texts, which support the pre-existence and the divinity of our Lord, do indeed resemble "the stars in the firmament." But I differ

mere accidental error "of the pen," or "of the press." If so, it clearly ranks with those *lucky* accidents, which we have had already to notice: for undoubtedly it happens most commodiously for the Unitarian. The Editors, it must be allowed, have not neglected the Primate, on other points throughout this verse. The words "gracious goodness" immediately preceding those to which we have adverted, he had otherwise rendered in the margin, "grace;" and such is the "scrupulous fidelity," (as Mr. Belsham calls it,) with which the Editors, *in all cases*, either follow the Primate or give notice of their departure from him, that they apprize us of *this momentous change*, in a *special note* upon the subject. Possibly, the *great importance* of this so occupied their attention, that it was altogether diverted from the variation in the remaining part of the sentence: which, indeed, *merely* affected the matter of our Lord's PRE-EXISTENCE; a thing in its own nature so absurd and inconceivable, that, be it expressed in what terms it may, it is well known that no RATIONAL CHRISTIAN can admit even its possibility.

I have, on former occasions, been tempted to travel beyond my immediate and proper subject, the mere *fact* of unacknowledged departure from the *Primate's* Version, into the nature of the criticism, by which the Editors support their peculiar translation: and I am not able to resist the desire of doing so on the present occasion. I shall follow the very words and order of the Editors in their note. "While he was rich—see Wakefield—*πλουσιος ων, επτωχευσε*. The construction* requires

from him in his *Astronomy*. The stars are, in "*the reality*," more and greater than they appear: and they are presented to the telescope in greater numbers than to the naked eye.

* Mr. Belsham's profound acquaintance with the Greek

it to be understood, not of a passage from a preceding state of wealth to a succeeding state of poverty, but of two cotemporary states. He was rich and poor at the same time.”—Now, here the Editors

language, has enabled him to pronounce, in still stronger terms, on the *necessity* of admitting the existence of two contemporary states to have been here intended. “That this is the proper primary meaning of the Apostle’s words,” he affirms, that “no person acquainted with the original can doubt.” And he questions, “whether the genius of the Greek language will even admit of the sense commonly annexed to the words.” (*Calm Inq.* p. 125.) It is whimsical enough, however, that all this extraordinary knowledge of the Greek language, which has enabled Mr. Belsham to pronounce thus decisively, on what “the construction” so peremptorily “requires,” has been, as he informs us, the result of a valuable hint from a friend, who, it seems, understands *English* remarkably well, as he has proved “by the accuracy of his remarks upon the English verb.” This Gentleman, who has written upon the *English verb*, has, we are told, actually assured Mr. Belsham, that “the aorist expresses a perfect action in past definite time; which time is ascertained by the connexion:” and has thus at once proved every thing to his wish; and completely satisfied him, that the *genius of the Greek language* “requires, that the two states should be simultaneous.” And then the whole follows smoothly.—“Christ *πτωχευει*, ‘was poor.’ When?—*πλεσις αν*, ‘at the time that he was rich.’” (*ibid.* p. 124.)—Now, with all due deference, I would recommend it to Mr. Belsham, to turn from this gentleman, notwithstanding the knowledge of the *English* language which he may possess, to those who may be somewhat more conversant with the *Greek*; and who possibly may tell him, that, so far is the *Greek aorist* from “expressing a perfect action in past definite time,” the very essence of the *aorist* is (as its name denotes) its *indefiniteness*: and that, instead of referring always to a “past definite time,” it is in frequent and common use for a time *not past*; being familiarly employed for *present* time, and not unusually for *future* time also. The force of the *Greek aorist*, in short, undergoes as many variations, as can well be superinduced upon a verb: indicating not only the *future* and the *present* as well as the *past*; but the *past* also under various modifications, including those of the common *preterite* and even of the *plusquam perfectum*, according as the connexion may require. It may imply, besides, in some cases, *frequency*; in some, the *continuance* of an action: and it is capable of admitting yet farther varieties,

have fortunately directed our attention to a few simple points, on which it is not difficult to form a decided judgment. "The construction *requires*,"

from the *mood* or *voice* in which it may be used, and also from its *participial* application. In a word, this tense, which is said to look to "*past definite time*," may look to *past*, *present*, or *future*, and has its very essence in the *indefiniteness* of the time and mode in which it can be applied. It has been said, that there is no royal road to Mathematics. This saying may be equally applied to other branches of knowledge. They, I apprehend, can admit no short path either. Mr. Belsham may rest assured, that, to know the Greek language, it must be learned; and that a few general rules, which school boys commit to memory, will not convey an acquaintance with the genius of the language.

The Greek, however, which Mr. Belsham has derived from this excellent English scholar of his acquaintance, may answer very well for those, for whom it is intended. And as Mr. Belsham has, in the outset of his work, declared against "*grammatical subtilties*;" and has entered his protest against admitting into consideration, the "*niceties*" of the Greek language, (under which head the *aorists*, of course, are to be included, no less than the *article*,) he ought not to be pressed closely upon this point. But, although the persons, for whom alone he professes to write, may not be much acquainted with the Greek language; and the account of the aorist, which he has picked up for their use, may be just as satisfactory to them as any other; yet it is to be supposed, they have some knowledge of their own language: and if so, surely the man of "sound understanding" will, at all events, be able to see, that whatever may be said of Mr. Belsham's *Greek*, he has manifestly blundered in *plain English*. For, after telling us, that the verb, of which he speaks, must, in virtue of the tense, in which he finds it, express a *perfect action* in past definite time, he proceeds to say that the verb must be rendered, "*was poor*." Now, how *being poor* can be called an *action*; and how the words, *was poor*, render this a *perfect action*;—Mr. Belsham will, if he can, explain to his reader.—Again, *when* was it that this *perfect action*, 'he *was poor*,' took place? We are answered, "*AT THE TIME* that he was rich." Surely, Mr. Belsham must have forgotten; and has been all this while arguing for the *transition*, not for the *continuance*. We can understand the *perfect action* of a person's *having become poor*, or *having made himself poor*, *AT* a particular time: but it will require a degree of subtilty, of which Mr. Belsham's man of "sound understanding" may possibly not find

that the words, *πλουσιος ων επτωχευσε*, should be understood of "two cotemporary states—He was rich and poor at the same time."—The *construc-*

himself possessed, to discover a *perfect action*, and an *implied continuance*, in the words "he was poor, *at* the time that he was rich."

But there is some more Greek of Mr. Belsham's, in the same note, which contains an ore of the richest criticism. He says, "it may be objected that *πλουσιος ων* may refer to past time." And this application of the participle present, *ων*, to past time, he strenuously rejects; although he has both here, and elsewhere when it suited his purpose, admitted the reference to past time in the words *τυφλος ων*, in John ix. 25. Under this admission, however, I will take the liberty of considering the sentence somewhat after the model, which he has proposed. "Christ *επτωχευσε* 'became poor.' When? *πλουσιος ων*, 'at the time that he was rich.'" I ask no more than the benefit of the canon, which Mr. Belsham has laid down for his own use: and which, as it is found not to suit his purpose, may, since it has been brought forward, be applied to mine. Mr. Belsham, however, produces some more Greek, to prove, that John ix. 25. supplies no authority, for referring the participle *ων* to *past time*. He contends, that, as the words *τυφλος ων* are there followed by the adverb *αρτι*, to 'shew that the participle which precedes is to be understood in a preterite sense;" so here, "had the Apostle intended to express, that the state of poverty was subsequent to that of affluence, he would probably have introduced the word *ετα*, or *ουστις*, before the verb *επτωχευσε*." Whether the Apostle, intending to express an *immediate* transition from one state to the other, would have thought it necessary to introduce either of these words, I leave it to Mr. Belsham, (who, it seems, after all, has been, in his own way, investigating the "*niceties*" of the Greek language,) to determine. But, I fear much, that, if the criticism respecting these words, be no sounder, than that, which relates to the word *αρτι*, the Apostle would not have availed himself of the suggestion which it contains, had it been proposed to him. The adverb *αρτι*, we are informed, shews, that the participle is to be understood in a preterite sense. In other words, it expresses the present time so emphatically, as to mark an opposition to *past time*:—"now I see." If this discovery of Mr. Belsham's be just, it will help us to various new and important views of scripture language. When our Saviour says to the Jews, (Matth. xxvi. 53.) "Thinkest thou that I cannot now" (*αρτι*, now, in opposition to *past time*;) "pray to my

tion requires no such thing. The plain and unavoidable construction of the words *πλουσιος ων*, all the world, except the Unitarian Editors, must ad-

father," &c. our Lord must be supposed to mean, that before this time he could not have done so. Again, when (John. xiii. 7.) he says to Peter, "What I do, thou knowest not *now*," (*αρτι*,) he must mean, that Peter had now lost the knowledge which at a former time he possessed. It immediately follows to be sure, "but thou shalt know *hereafter*," as if the opposition here were to *future* time. This however is a trifling difficulty in the way of a *Unitarian critic*, and would soon be in some mode or other disposed of. Again, when Peter says, (John xiii. 37.) "Lord, why cannot I follow thee *now*," (*αρτι*,) he must mean this in comparison with *past* time: although hitherto it has been imagined, that he alluded to our Saviour's words, "thou shalt follow me *hereafter*." In like manner, when our Lord tells his disciples, that he has still many things to say to them, and adds, "ye cannot bear them *now*," (*αρτι*,) he must be understood to imply, that they could have borne them *before* that time, although it has been commonly supposed that the expression looked to the *future*. It will be found also in 1 Cor. xiii. 12. xvi. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 7. and in other places, that this lately discovered and significant use of the word *αρτι*, will throw a novel light upon the words of Scripture.—But, to treat this matter with a seriousness to which perhaps it is not entitled, the truth is, that *αρτι*, of itself, simply and properly though emphatically signifies the present time; and is only so far opposed to either the past time or the future, as *present* time is opposed to each: and derives its reference to the one or the other, solely from the words, with which it is connected in the context; so that, instead of bestowing such reference on, it borrows it from, the sentence in which it stands. If, then, Mr. Belsham can find no other reason for rendering the participle in *τυφλος ων* in a preterite sense, than the declaration of the *present* possession of sight implied in the word *αρτι*, he will find himself at perfect liberty to render the passage, in a form similar to that, which he proposes for this of 2 Corinthians, *I now see whilst I am blind*. Whoever has considered these matters, must be well aware, that it is the nature of the subject and the force of the context, and not the mere use of the word *αρτι*, that leads the mind to the immediate admission, that it must be to a *past* time, that the blind man refers the participle, when he uses the words, *τυφλος ων, αρτι ελεπω*. This will be manifest at once, if we change the word *τυφλος* for another. For example, the Jews had de-

mit to be, *Being rich*. Well then, how does the *being rich* render it impossible for a man to *become poor*? On the contrary, must not a man *be rich*, in

manded of the blind man's parents, whether it really was their son, (who was well known to have been blind,) that now professed to be restored to sight. Suppose they had put the question to the man himself in this form. "Art thou the son of these persons, and dost thou now see," *αρτι ελεπαις*? Suppose also, that he wishing to answer the question precisely, by declaring that he was *their* son, and that he then actually saw, used the words *αυτων μεν ο υιος αν, αρτι ελεπω*—must he be thought necessarily to mean, that he *had been at a former time* the son of these persons; or would not, in this case, the participle be taken in the present time, unaffected by the use of the word *αρτι*?—Or again, if the question had related to his conviction, that his sight was permanently restored; and that he meant to reply, that though he possessed the power of seeing perfectly at the present, he yet had fears as to its continuance for the future; and, in order to convey this, expressed himself in these words, *φοβουμενος μεν (viz. μηποτε τυφλος γινωμαι) αρτι ελεπω*—must the mere use of the word *αρτι* push back his fears lest he might ultimately lose his sight, to a time previous to his having recovered it; although, in reality, the present time is here put in opposition to that *future* time to which his fears relate? In these two instances we see, that, according to Mr. Belsham's criticism, both that which is declared to exist at the *present*, and that which is meant to refer to the *future*, must be thrown back to a preceding period, by the operation of the adverb *αρτι*.

Had our Lord said to himself, *πλουσιος αν αρτι πτωχευω*, Mr. Belsham would of course admit, that he spoke of two successive states; whilst, by omitting the word *αρτι* here, two concurrent states must, according to him, be intended. This is precisely equivalent to what he has advanced; viz. that there being no particle corresponding to the word *αρτι*, to determine the participle *αν* to the sense of the *preterite*, it *must* consequently be considered in the *present* tense. It should be observed, that the peculiar meaning, which this writer would force upon the word *πτωχευω*, has nothing to do with the application of his criticism here, respecting the word *αρτι*. This criticism, as well as that concerning the force of the *aorist*, stands by itself, on grounds independent of the peculiar force of the verb employed. But, allowing to Mr. Belsham, (for the sake of argument,) the full benefit of the force which he assigns to the verb *πτωχευω*; namely, that of a continued state; let us see, to what this will lead

order to admit the propriety of saying that he *became poor*? Is it impossible, that a man who is rich at *one* time, should become poor at *another*? or is it

us. If, in consequence of this, the phrase *πλουσιος ὡν ἐπτάχευσε*, must signify, that he continued rich *whilst* he lived poor; it must of course follow, that St. Paul has represented both to the Ephesians and the Colossians, that *WHILST continuing dead in their sins* they were permitted to *live with Christ*, νεκροὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι—συνεζωοποιήσας. Ephes. ii. 5. Col. ii. 13.—and again, that St. John, *at the very time* that he was writing the 8th verse of the 22d chapter of the Revelations, was *actually engaged in hearing and seeing* all those various communications and visions, which he has related to us—Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης ο ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων ταῦτα.—Of so little value, indeed, did Grotius (the great authority, to which the Unitarians are, on all occasions anxious to resort,) consider such *critical "niceties,"* as Mr. Belsham has here laid down as principles; so little, especially, did he conceive the word *ἄρτι* to be requisite to give a past sense to the present participle, that he pronounces the very phrase in John ix. 25, in which *ἄρτι* has, according to Mr. Belsham, given the *whole* force, to be exactly similar to that in Eph. ii. 5, in which the participle present simply occurs, without any word whatever corresponding to *ἄρτι*, such as Mr. Belsham peremptorily insists upon.—“[*τυφλος ὢν*] ὢν, *qui eram*, ut hic *Syrus*. Simile loquendi genus, vide Ephes. ii. 5.”—And again, on the passage in the Apocalypse, he says—“*Subauditur sum*, ut sæpe apud Hebræos: et *præsens pro præterito proximo*.” This, indeed, St. John has himself put entirely beyond question, by subjoining to the words already quoted, καὶ ὅτι ἤκουσα καὶ εἶδον. And, what crowns the whole, and leaves nothing more to be desired upon the subject,—those great Greek critics, who have given us what they are pleased to call the IMPROVED VERSION, have not pronounced St. John to have been ignorant of the genius of the Greek language in doing so; but have actually bestowed their own decisive imprimatur, and have given it to us in plain English, “I John SAW these things and HEARD them”—ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων.

Now that I have obtained so high a sanction for the application of the participle present in a preterite sense, without the assistance of the word *ἄρτι*, or any other particle whatever; I will venture to tell Mr. Belsham, that nothing is more common: that, to those who are well acquainted with the language, this usage is perfectly familiar: and that the reason of the thing, and the circumstances under which it occurs, are fully explained and defined by various well known writers. Among these wri-

necessary, that a person described as *being rich* and *becoming poor*, should be both *rich* and *poor* at the *same time*? Yes, say the Editors, the con-

ters I would particularly specify, Dr. Middleton, (Doct. of the Gr. Art. p. 39—44.) and Glassius, (Philol. Sacr. tom. i. p. 353—355.)—the latter of whom has accompanied his grammatical remarks upon the participle, with some most valuable observations on important passages of the N. T. in which the participle occurs. I confess, at the same time, that I am disposed to agree with Mr. Belsham, in conceding to the participle *ων*, under certain circumstances, an emphatical force which may imply continuance. It is manifest, that it may be rendered *BEING*, in such a sense as shall reach to the nature and essence of the subject. Thus, he who had been born blind, *being* (from nature) *blind*, (that is, such being the state and condition which belonged to him,) declares, that he *now sees*. But, then, Mr. Belsham will be pleased to recollect, that this use of the participle involves unavoidably the reference to an antecedent condition; and is, although it implies a *continued state* and appears in a *present form*, as little to be confounded in point of time with the new state affirmed of the subject, as the word *blind* is to be confounded with it in the 17th verse, where the Pharisees are described as interrogating the *blind* man, (λεγας το τυφλω,) as to the *manner*, in which *his sight had been restored*. By his being here called a *blind* man, at the very time when the mode of the acquisition of his sight was the subject of enquiry, what could be meant but his natural state, and of course his previous condition; the same which may be conceived to be conveyed by τυφλος ΩΝ. In like manner, when our Saviour expresses himself to the disciples of John in these words,—“the *blind* see”—“the *lame* walk,”—(τυφλοι αναβλεπουσιν—χαλροι περιπατουσιν—) he means, that those, whose nature it had been to be *blind* and *lame*, now saw and walked. He did not think it necessary to introduce any particle, (such as *αρτι*,) to mark the opposition of the two conditions: and, yet, there does not appear much danger, that any person, from the *excessive* knowledge of Greek that governs Mr. Belsham’s criticisms, should suppose, that there must be two concurring states; and that our Lord had carried the miracle so far, as to enable them to see, *whilst they remained* blind; or to walk, *whilst they continued* lame:—the species of construction, which Mr. Belsham insists upon, in the passage before us. The pre-existence of our Lord is, it is to be presumed, a thing so incredible, that any monstrum cogitationis is to be received before it: and, therefore, if the above

struction requires that the two states should be *contemporary*. To common sense, this seems somewhat odd. But it appears evident, they say, from

passage happened to bear such relation to that doctrine, as to give it support according to the received mode of its translation, Mr. Belsham would, of course, on the principle of interpretation which he wishes to apply to 2 Cor. viii. 9, contend for the *seeing blindness*, and the *walking lameness*, to which we have alluded.

ΠΛΟΥΣΙΟΣ *ων*, then, we may, with strict propriety, render “*BEING rich*”—*being, in his true nature, rich indeed*—*εν μορφῇ Θεου υπαρχων*.—ΩΝ and ΤΙΠΑΡΧΩΝ here correspond exactly as they ought,—the essence and true nature of the Great Being emphatically expressed in both. All this, it must be confessed, carries with it a reference to past time; to an antecedent condition. But that cannot be helped, if truth will have it so. *BEING* (in his true nature and essence) *rich, he became poor*.—“*Being rich, he became poor*.”—It is manifest, that here is the plain, literal and consistent interpretation of the passage, without the slightest force exercised on any one part of it, and in exact agreement with all the ordinary received principles of scripture interpretation. Whether this be reconcilable with the common translation, “*Though he was rich, he became poor*,” the reader will judge; and “*whether the genius of the Greek language will admit of this sense*,” he may now determine for himself. Whether, on the other hand, the principles of “*the construction*,” which “*requires that the two states should be simultaneous*,” can be received by any “*person acquainted with the original*,” he will probably more than “*doubt*.” That the participle *ων* must, in the first place, express simple *continuance*, of the state expressed by *πλουσιος*: that, in the second place, *επαρχουσι* must express simple *continuance* of *its* state likewise: and that, in the third place, the one state must commence, and be exactly concurrent with the other. He could not *have been* rich one moment *before* he was poor:—his riches commenced and continued with his poverty. It was precisely “*whilst* he was rich” that “*he was poor*.” Surely, all this is too much to require us to concede. Independently of all consideration of the original language, I would desire no more for a fair judgment upon the case, than the “*sound understanding and honest mind*,” to which Mr. Belsham *professes* himself so willing to appeal.

It is curious, and may not be uninteresting, to observe the whimsical varieties of Socinian criticism, and the capricious changes of shape which it assumes. In former days, a grand

the words, *πλουσιος ων*, which they choose to render, WHILE *he was rich*. The word WHILE establishes the whole for them: proves that the two states

support of the system, which rejected the *divinity* of Christ, rested upon the *past* sense of the participle, *ων*. Socinus, conceiving that this participle has no adsignification of *present* time, was for confining it to the *past*; that he might get rid of the overbearing force of the words, *ο ων εν ταις ουραναις*, in John iii. 13. which he was thus enabled to render *qui ERAT in cælo*; and, under this interpretation to afford an explanation, according to his own principles, by which he might avoid the admission of our Lord's pre-existence: as may be seen at page 303 of this volume. The *present* Socinians having discovered, (see pp. 295—296. 301.) that “BEING IN HEAVEN” can mean no such thing as it expresses; *because there is no heaven*: and that the words merely signify the *being acquainted with the divine counsels*, or no matter what, but certainly NOT *being in heaven*, (for that could not be, besides that “the *natural signification* of words” is, as we have seen at page 226 of this volume, *above all things* to be guarded against,)—have felt themselves altogether relieved from the difficulties of old Socinus. They have, no longer, any occasion for the *past* sense of the participle: and seeing, that the admission of this sense, would let in the *pre-existence* upon them elsewhere, (as for example in this very passage of 2 Corinthians,) they, accordingly, contend strenuously for the *present* signification, and will have nothing to do with the *past*, which threatens little less than ruin to their scheme. However, these modern critics, who go by no rule but that of *shutting out the Divinity of Christ*, do themselves, at certain times, when off their guard, admit the very interpretation of the participle which they are here so anxious to reject. Thus, (as we have already noticed at p. 294 of this vol.) on John i. 18, *ο ων εις των πολλων τε πατρων*, the Editors observe, in their note, that it is better rendered, “who WAS in the beginning with God—to derive instruction,” &c. (that is, by the bye, as they tell us again, I. V. p. 199.) “was IN THE WILDERNESS OR ELSEWHERE to be instructed and disciplined.”!!!—Here, then, after all, the grand point so long laboured for every where else is given up. The participle *ων* may, even according to these great authorities, be taken in the *past* sense: and this too, it is to be observed, where the *past* time is not superinduced by any connected verb. For, it is to be remarked, that in this passage, the participle is not placed as the nominative to the verb; and therefore stands independently of the time of that verb. In truth, if, in any part of the

must be concurrent; and settles the entire question of construction at once. This word, however, unfortunately, is altogether of their own manufacture,

N. T. the participle of *existence* is to be considered as peculiarly expressive of *essence*; if there be any, in which no good reason appears for referring the participle to a limited adsignification of time, it is perhaps this very passage. And yet it is almost here alone, that these extraordinary critics would ascribe to it a *past* sense. However, in justice it must be confessed, they make ample and speedy retribution. In return for what they have thus taken *from* the *present* time, they immediately after, (that is, *after* in *their* translation, for they find it convenient, in this first chapter of St. John's Gospel, to turn every thing upside down; and therefore have, without any authority but their own sole will and pleasure, placed the 15th after the 18th verse,)—they immediately after, I say, in the 15th verse, convert the *past* into the *present*, by construing *ἐγώ εἰμι*; rendering *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ κύριός μου*, “he is my *principal*,” in opposition to the obvious and just translation, “he was before me,” which has been adopted by every commentator that has hitherto appeared; not excepting even their own great oracles, Erasmus and Grotius, to whom they affect to appeal on all occasions, but whom they desert as they do all others, whenever they fail to assist in the main point, that of reducing our blessed Lord to the ordinary condition of man. Great allowance, undoubtedly, should be made for these Unitarian Critics, in their comments upon this first chapter of St. John. In contemplating this part of Scripture, they seem bewildered to the last degree. They scarcely know what they say: and hardly can any two be found to agree in the same result. The distraction in truth, which appears to agitate them, can scarcely be represented to the imagination, by any thing short of the picture, which Hogarth has given of the enraged musician. Their incoherencies here, then, should perhaps, in some degree, be overlooked. But, in other places, where they are not driven to it by the same terrific necessity, we find them without scruple rendering the *present* by the *past*. Mr. Belsham labours hard, (by a number of examples, some applicable, and some not,) to establish the admissibility of this, in the case of the verb substantive, for the purpose of supporting the Socinian sense of *ἐγώ εἰμι*, “I was *he*,” in the celebrated passage in which our Lord declares that he existed before Abraham, and which has been already adverted to in the preceding note, p. 329. (See *Calm Inq.* pp. 74, 75, 86, 87, 96, 98.) The Imp. Vers. also, in all those places,

or rather that of Mr. Wakefield; and has been forced in here, against all just principles of criticism, to help out that very construction which, they say,

where it might tend to advance the main point, has adopted the same principle of interpretation. Thus we see, that the construction, which, at one time, these critics reject as inadmissible, at others they adopt with perfect freedom: at all times, however, it must be admitted, in reference to the one grand object, that of robbing Christ of the divinity of his nature. In any case, whatever mode of interpretation favours this object, must be right; although it is to be relinquished, and the opposite mode adopted for the same object, in the succeeding page. Rules of grammar are of no value. One rule only is to be attended to. All tenses are to be intermixed, all times to be confounded; provided only that that exalted Being, the Son of God, who fills all time, shall be confined to such a portion of it, as falls to the lot of mere, miserable, mortal man.

Of these contradictory and mutually subversive positions, respecting the force of Greek tenses, abundant instances have been already derived from Mr. Belsham and his brother editors. But one still remains, which I have purposely reserved for the conclusion of this note. We have seen, that the great stress of Mr. Belsham's grammatical argument in support of the Unitarian rendering of 2 Cor. viii. 9. depends upon the construction of the aorist under that peculiar reference to *past time*, which we have quoted from him at page 255 of his book, and which, as we have noticed, he exults in having derived from a learned friend, inasmuch as by it he considers himself enabled, to decide the question of the sense of the disputed passage. Now what shall we say, if we find this same writer, asserting of the aorist of a particular verb, that it "occurs 38 times in the New Testament; and in *five passages only* signifies *past time*." Yet this he does of the verb *γενεσθαι*; because the applying to it a future sense furnishes one of the Unitarian modes of escaping the inference of our Lord's pre-existence from John viii. 58. It is not, indeed, the particular mode of escape, which this writer has selected as the best; but it is one, which he mentions with respect, and something like commendation: and, so far as the criticism on the verb *γενεσθαι* is concerned, manifestly with approbation. So that, at the beginning of this note, we find this writer, at the suggestion of *one* friend, maintaining the *necessity* of the *past sense* for the Greek aorist; and at the conclusion of it, we leave him in the full possession of an opposite suggestion from *another* friend, which completely

requires it. The original, as we have seen, simply expresses, *Being rich*. That the word WHILE has no place in it, is manifest: and that there can be no *pretence* for its introduction, shall be shewn hereafter. But, for the present, let it be observed, that even admitting the translation of the Editors, *while he was rich*, it will not follow, that the sentence must be understood of two cotemporary states, so long as the word *επωχευσε* signifies *he became poor*, and thereby marks a transition from one state to the other. They seem to think, indeed, that the word *while* precludes this rendering of the verb *επωχευσε*; and, for this reason, they have caught eagerly at the authority of Mr. Wakefield, for the introduction of that particle. Now it fortunately happens, that Mr. Wakefield himself, their favourite critic, is the very authority I have to adduce upon this subject. What is *his* rendering of

overturns the former. How the critic is to act between the two descriptions of learned friends,—how to choose *between the two bundles*—I know not.

Before I quit the subject of *tenses*, on which this note has been principally employed, I shall add this one remark on the text last alluded to;—that the only contrivances, by which Unitarians are able to evade its force, are the changes of the *past* into the *future*, or of the *present* into the *past*. Πεν Αβρααμ γενεσθαι, εγω ειμι.—Before Abram SHALL BECOME (*Abraham*), I am (*he*:)—or, Before Abraham was born, I WAS (*he*.) In the former, *γενεσθαι* is made *future*: in the latter, *ειμι* is made to signify the *past*. The plain and simple translation is by all means to be avoided by Unitarian critics. But may not expositors, of inferior lights, avail themselves of both the great contending authorities; and with the one be permitted to render *γενεσθαι* in the *past* sense, and *ειμι* in the *present* sense with the other? And thus, even Unitarian criticism may be made to minister to the truth; and to give support to that great fundamental TRUTH, the PRE-EXISTENCE of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.—On this text in John viii. 58. see what has been already said, at. p. 53—56. vol. i. of this work.

the clause? "*While* he was rich,* he *became* poor." See his Translation of the New Testament. Mr. W. must be supposed, if we would acquit him of a gross blunder in language and a gross confusion of ideas, to have here employed the word *while*, in the sense of *when, at a time when*: for, to conceive it as implying a lengthened space, would be to make the *point of time, at which* he *became* poor, commensurate with a *portion of time, during* which he *continued* rich. I do not say, that I should approve of such a form of expression. But it is the one adopted by him, whom the Unitarians look up to as their greatest scholar; and whatever objection can be brought against it, is to be applied to the word *while*, which he and they have unjustifiably forced upon the sentence; the use of which, however, could not prevent Mr. W. from giving to the verb $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ the sense of † *becoming poor*: a sense, which

* The Editors have made their quotation from this writer with no small degree of judgment. It stands thus, as we have seen at page 331—"While he was rich—see Wakefield— $\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\iota$."—The part of the sentence, which is broken off, and by which the last of these three Greek words is rendered, would have spoiled all:—"he *BECAME* poor," would have let in orthodoxy again, whereas the part quoted bade fair to thrust it out. Now, this is a specimen of *Unitarian* quotation: and this too, on a subject, on which the departure from truth is the stifling of God's revelation. Mr. Wakefield's criticisms may be of but little value: and, for my own part, I have not been in the habit of rating them at much. But not so with the Editors. With them he is oracular. Or, be it that I state this too strongly, yet, at all events, to quote his words as *bearing on the sacred text*, and to quote them *falsely*, is dealing treacherously with THE WORD OF GOD: and is but too well worthy of the cause, in which *they* are engaged, who would *blaspheme* the Majesty of the SON OF GOD.

† It may be said, that in his Inquiry, Mr. Wakefield has rendered $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ in the sense of *being*, not of *becoming, poor*; and has there considered the whole passage, as treating of simultaneous, not successive, states. To this I answer, it sig-

at once overturns the whole fabric of their construction.—Well then, thus far, the Editors do not appear to be particularly fortunate, in the observa-

nifies nothing to the present point, in what manner he has translated the word, or understood the passage, *there*; although, *even there*, he has only ventured to say of *πταχῦνα*, after reciting the usual rendering *to become poor*, that it “RATHER means to be in the *condition and capacity* of a *poor man*.” (p. 179.) We are at present concerned not with that work, but with his Translation of the New Testament; the second edition of which, (the only one in my possession) was published *eleven years later* than the Inquiry; and in which, of course, we have the final result of his best judgment upon the subject. To this later work the Editors have referred, by their quotation, for the support of his authority in rendering the words *πλουσιος αν*, “WHILE *he was rich*.” So that, on every account, to *this* work our attention must be necessarily confined.—The Editors, indeed, must have been much puzzled, as to which of the two productions of this great Unitarian authority they should abide by. They would naturally prefer the former, as rendering *πταχῦνα* in the sense of BEING *poor*: but then, the first clause of the translation did not furnish them with the governing emphasis of the particle WHILE, as *πλουσιος αν* was *there* rendered, BEING *poor*. On the other hand, in the later production of this author, the word WHILE was employed; but then the orthodox sense of the verb *επταχυσει* (*became poor*) was retained. The Editors, in this difficulty, adopted the most prudent plan. They followed the latter, in the first clause; and totally sunk the remainder, as we have seen in the preceding note. At the same time, that the Unitarian sense of the word *πταχῦνα*, advanced in the Inquiry, should not be lost, it was deemed right, that in a separate work, which is, in truth, but a supplement, or body of notes, to the Unitarian Version, the translation as given in the Inquiry should be exclusively enforced. Whilst, therefore, the Editors refer only to Mr. Wakefield’s New Testament, and select from that, *just* what answers their immediate purpose; Mr. Belsham refers only to that writer’s Inquiry, and secures to the cause the additional aid that was to be *thence* derived. Calm Inq. p. 125.—Let not the mean opinion that the reader may entertain of Mr. Wakefield as a critic and a theologian, induce him to discredit the idea, that so much machinery should be employed, for such a purpose as that of obtaining the apparent sanction of his name. It should be remembered, that there is a class of men, by whom an author with *any* pretensions to the distinction of a

tions, with which they commence. The translation, "*while* he was rich," does *not* appear to be the just rendering of the words *πλουσιος ων*:—the construction does *not require* to be understood of two cotemporary states:—and Mr. Wakefield, whom they appeal to in the very frontispiece of their note, and whose name stands in the place, that, according to their engagements, should have been occupied by that of Newcome, turns out to be an authority *decisively against* them.

But, in truth, the grand hinge of the question is the meaning of the verb *πτωχευσε*. It is useless to talk of *two cotemporary states*, until it be determined whether there be, in strictness, *two STATES* spoken of at all. The Editors, not being able to rid themselves of a lurking feeling on this head, although they profess to have settled the point already by the force of the word *WHILE*, proceed to fix the sense of the verb *πτωχευω*, agreeably to the interpretation of the passage, which they have already resolved on: and having cited the* Lexicons of

scholar, and at the same time lending his authority to the support of their opinions, may reasonably be deemed a paragon: and it is known, that there are writers, and translators, with whom such machinery is no novelty, and who can lose no character by resorting to it.

* The quotations from these Lexicons are, like most of the Unitarian quotations, *ad captum* merely. Advantage is taken of a partial and seeming correspondence, whilst every expression that marks a departure is carefully suppressed. The object, with the Lexicons here quoted, has been more to convey the full force of the word *πτωχος* carried into act by the verb, than to distinguish (if I may so say,) the precise *verbal* modification, as to the point of continuance or change. The Editors have omitted to mention, among the interpretations assigned in each of these Lexicons, the word *mendico*: which, as it implies simply an *act*, and does not in itself *necessarily* include the idea of a *continued state*, or *course of action*, (any more than the word *σταιτω*, or *stipem peto*, to which both the Lexicons, after Hesychius, make *πτωχευω* sometimes equivalent,)—it would

Stephanus, and Constantine, for the use of the verb in the senses of “mendicus sum,” “mendicus vivo,” “inops dego,” and Erasmus, for the sense of “pau-

not have suited the purpose of the Editors to have particularly noticed. The Latin terms, it must be observed by which the Greek verb is explained, are equivocal in their application. Indeed, if it were not so, the argument of the Editors would go to the length of proving, that the word *πταχυνω*, in the judgment of the compilers of these Lexicons, could *never* be applied in the sense of BECOMING *poor*. Now, this would be to brand their own authorities with gross ignorance: an ignorance, however, of which the learned authors would soon be acquitted, by those, who would take the trouble to examine, what they say for themselves. For we find in the former of the two Lexicons, the passage of Nazianzen, *πταχυνει την εμην σαρκα*, rendered by the words, “ob meam carnem *pauper* FIT; and in the latter, we have the same translation acknowledged as assigned to this Greek sentence. Again, with respect to the very text in question, (2 Cor. viii. 9.) we find, that, although the word *eguit* has been used by both, for *πταχυσει*, yet Stephanus, who has adopted the translation of Constantine, but in a form more copious and explanatory, immediately subjoins, what manifestly shews, that he understood the word to imply a *change* of condition,—“*Usus autem eo verbo est Apostolus, ut ostenderet eum (Christum scil.) usque ad extremam etiam paupertatem nostra causa sese demisisse*”—*had humbled himself, had reduced himself*. See Thes. vol. 3. p. 587. And this same Stephanus, in his Concordance, (which, it should be remembered too, was not published for more than twenty years after his Thesaurus,) assigns to the verb *πταχυνω*, as its single and sole signification, the words “*pauper* FIO,” to BECOME *poor*. It seems rather odd, that the Editors, whose object was the translation of the *Greek of the New Testament*, should have altogether *forgotten* to look into the Concordance, in which Stephanus professes to give the meaning of the *Greek of the New Testament*; and in which he gives the latest result of his judgment,—a book, too, which they themselves recommend, in the Introduction to their Version, for the interpretation of the New Testament: and, also, that they should have *forgotten*, even to glance at the observations, which we have quoted from both Stephanus and Constantine, in those very parts of their Lexicons, from which they have favoured us with extracts.—In truth, it is perfectly manifest, that, so far as the Editors’ assertion, that the word *πταχυνω* cannot properly

per fuit sive *potius* mendicavit;”* they then at once peremptorily conclude,—“the word properly signifies an actual state, not a change of state. Literally

signify a *change* of state, is concerned, the authority of these writers is decidedly against them.

As to the Lexicons, generally, it should be remarked, that they represent the word *πτωχος*, as in itself implying a *change* of condition. Schleusner explains the word, “*pauper, ad mendicitatem REDACTUS, &c.*” Suidas defines, *πτωχος*,—“*ο ἐκπταχως τὸ εἶναι*,”—“*qui ex bonorum possessione excidit:*” and *πτωχεια*,—“*παντλης τῆς κτησεως ἐκπτωσις.*” Suicer in like manner, “*Πτωχος PROPRIE est, ο ἀπο πλετῆς καταλθὼν εἰς ἐνδύαν, qui ex divitiis ad inopiam DEVOLUTUS EST.*” (Thes. Eccles. p. 887.) Amongst other derivations assigned to the word, that of *πτω* (*cado*) an obsolete for *πιπ*ω, and from which *πιπ*ω takes its preterite *πεπ*τωκα, is the most prevalent and the most probable. And, in this view, the primary sense of the word *πτωχος*, and consequently of *πτωχευω*, ought to imply a *change* of state, a *fall* from wealth. The great attention bestowed by the Lexicons generally, upon the *extreme degree of poverty* expressed by the word *πτωχευω*, and upon the distinction to be observed between *πτωχος* and *πενης*, seems to be the reason why the primary sense has been in most cases especially dwelt upon, and the peculiar force of the *verb*, as relating to an *existing* or a *commencing* state, (a *continuance* or a *change* of condition,) has not been more fully taken into consideration; but left, as it naturally ought, to be determined by the particular bearing of the context. As far as the *verb* merely is concerned, *πτωχος sum et fio*, (in the form given by Schleusner) seems to be its just representation. And it is worthy of remark, that if *πτωχος* itself implies a change of condition, *ad mendicitatem redactus*, then even the acceptance of the *verb* in the form of *πτωχος sum*, must imply the same.

* Erasmus has been extremely brief upon this, having simply stated his rendering of the Greek to be, as quoted above, “*pauper fuit, sive potius, mendicavit.*” *Mendicavit*, then, is the sense which he *prefers* for the word *πτωχισαι*. and he even follows it up by saying “*ut hinc possent argumentum sumere qui gaudent mendicitatem suam ad Christum autorem referre: alluding to the model, to which the Mendicant orders of the Romish clergy might refer, as their example.* Now, I would ask the Editors, why they have not abided by their own authority here, and rendered the Greek word in the strict sense, *mendicavit*, instead of adopting the translation agreeable to that sense which Erasmus holds to be *inferior*. They may say, perhaps,

he was poor, or he was a beggar. See Odyss. o. l. 308."—Thus the point is completely settled. The sense, which the construction, under the influence

that they quote Erasmus, merely to shew, that he understood the word to imply an actual state, and not a change of state. At all events, then, they do not deem his judgment such as should be implicitly relied upon, in his criticism upon this verse. But are they sure, that Erasmus meant by the word *mendico*, to *exclude* a change of state? Are they sure that Erasmus did not prefer the word *mendico*, because it might, like the Greek word, apply to the commencement, as well as to the continuance, of the course of action which it expressed: The verb *mendico*, *Facciolati*, in his excellent Lexicon, renders by *pitoccare*, from *pitocco*, which words are manifestly the transfusion of the Greek words *πρωχσω* and *πρωχος*: and the word *pitoccare* is known to be employed not only in the sense, to *beg*, but also to *go a begging*, to *become a beggar*. So that the word *mendico*, according to this authority, by no means excludes the idea of a *change of condition*. But, even though the Latin of Erasmus were unequivocally in their favour, yet, against the stream of authorities, which oppose him upon this subject, his simple dictum could be but of little force. Erasmus, it is to be remembered, lived but at the revival of letters; and was destitute of those many important aids to Greek literature, which have been furnished since his time. He was a scholar, *proprio Marte*; and although undoubtedly, a man of vast *genius* and extensive learning, and of infinitely attractive wit yet, in his *Greek* criticisms especially, he has been esteemed by many extremely fallible. Even Jortin, with all the partiality of a biographer who imagined that the historian bore some resemblance to his subject, admits the general suffrage of "his deficiency in the Greek tongue."—(Life of Erasmus, vol. ii. p. 160.) Erasmus himself, indeed, in his note on Mark ii. 9. makes plain confession of his inferiority in Greek literature. Marianus Victorius, in the preface to his Edition of Jerome, goes too far, when he charges him roundly with a total ignorance of the language. John Hales speaks not quite so strongly when he says, in his notes on Chrysost. Homil. in Hebr. "Acumen Erasmanæ censuræ et certitudinem, quam in *Latinis* præstat, in *Græcis* PRORSUS DESIDERO." Whatever justice there may be in this observation, as it relates to his Greek criticisms generally; there can be no question, as to its application, in those cases, in which a knowledge of the Hebrew was also necessary; that is, as to its application to the Greek language in use among the Jewish writers. Drusius, in

of the particle WHILE, would have given to the verb, is now proved to belong to it from an independent source. And so the question is at rest.

Yet a word or two remain to be said. We cannot allow these Critics to travel off so rapidly. We are here informed, that the word *πτωχευω* "*properly* signifies an actual state, not a change of state:" that is, that it means the actual state of BEING *poor*, and that it *cannot, properly*, signify to BECOME *poor*. We cannot avoid remarking here, how strangely ignorant Schleusner must be upon this subject; notwithstanding the high estimation, in which he is held by the Editors, and their great readiness to quote his authority whenever they can contrive to *pick out* any thing from him, that will afford the colour of a sanction to their opinions. How does *he* explain the word?—"1. *proprie: pauper sum et fio, ad mendicitatem REDACTUS SUM, mendico, a πτωχος, quod vide:*" and then he adduces a number of the preface to his *Præterita* in Nov. Test. expressly informs us, that he has thus entitled his criticisms on the New Testament, as having special reference to what had been *passed over*, or not sufficiently illustrated, by others; among whom he names Erasmus as the principal. This commentator possessed that, which Erasmus wanted. His perfect acquaintance with the Hebrew, the Jewish writers, the ancient Greek translators, and the productions of the Fathers, afforded him such eminent qualifications for commenting upon the sacred text, that P. Simon does not scruple to pronounce him the *most learned and judicious* critic in the whole assemblage of those distinguished Commentators on the old Testament, whose labours are preserved to us in the collection entitled *Critici Sacri*. See *Hist. Crit. du V. T.* liv. 3. ch. 15. The Editors have not informed us, in what sense, this writer, who has had Erasmus specially in his view throughout his comment on the N. T. has interpreted the word in question. They were not anxious to state, that the reviser of the criticisms of Erasmus, whilst he dwells at some length upon the comparison of *egenus* and *pauper*, in his comment on the verse before us, lays it down as a matter which *does not come at all into question*, that *factus est* is connected with both.—*Egenus FACTUS EST—Pauper FACTUS EST.*

references, the first of which is "Odyss. o. v. 308," the very one which the Editors have put forward,* and which in their lighter reading they must have

* It is to be observed, that the passage in Homer has been adduced by Schleusner, as an instance of the propriety of the sense of, *ad mendicitatem redactus sum*, mendico; having in view simply the force of the word *πτωχος*, mendicus, and not any modification of the act expressed by the verb, in reference to a change or continuance of state. This, as has been before observed, has been the main object with the Lexicographers and Commentators in general upon this word; the *extreme poverty*, which the word implies, being the idea principally held in view. That Schleusner, then, has cited the passage from the Odyssey, as equally applicable to the sense of *ad mendicitatem redactus sum*, and to that of *mendico*; and therefore (*were it even granted*, that *mendico* must necessarily imply the *continuance* of a state, and can never be attributed to the *first act or commencement*,) that he has connected the sense of *BECOMING a beggar*, equally as that of *BEING one*, with the example which he has quoted from Homer, is manifest on a moment's inspection. The Editors, on the other hand, have cited the very same example from Homer, for the purpose of shewing the direct contrary; namely, that the word *πτωχῶς* cannot properly signify a change of state. Now, although I have above acquitted these critics of having derived this reference from Schleusner, upon the ground, that they could scarcely be supposed to have overlooked or suppressed the notice of the matter supplied by that learned writer in direct opposition to their assertions; yet, on second thoughts, I see much stronger reasons for believing, that from *his* Lexicon they did actually transcribe this reference. The mere circumstance of overlooking or suppressing may easily be admitted, where practices of a much higher order of disingenuousness are found to be familiar. And, although it must be admitted, that other Lexicons, as well as that of Schleusner, contain the allusion to Homer, yet the precise form of the quotation here supplies an internal evidence of the source. One thing is certain, that if these critics had been searching through the Odyssey, for the purpose of discovering an application of the verb *πτωχῶς*, which would least serve their purpose, they would have cited the very one that has been adduced: inasmuch as its actual application here implies decidedly a *change* of state; Ulysses declaring his intention to assume the appearance of a new condition, and being now for the first time to *become* a beggar—*πτωχίσαν*. In four other passages of the Odyssey, they

discovered in the *Odyssey* for themselves; as it is not to be supposed, that they would have selected this single note from Schleusner, and have passed over in perfect silence the various remaining matter, which contradicts their assertion as to the import of the verb in question. Some of the authorities, to which Schleusner refers, shew the like ignorance with himself; since, like him, they employ the word *πρωχέω* in a sense implying a *change* of state. The LXX, he says,* make use of it in dif-

might have discovered the word, in an aspect not equally unfavourable to their position; at the same time, it is certain, that, neither there, nor elsewhere, can they possibly discover any thing, that would justify their assertion, that “the word *properly* signifies an actual state and not a change of state.” Thus it appears, that the Editors did not search out this example for themselves: and that, in truth, they did not know to what precise point of explanation it was adduced, in the *Lexicon*, from which they took it. The sound of Homer’s name would convey a grace; and might intimate something like an acquaintance with the Classics. Whether Homer, or any of the ancient Classics, have usually formed a part of the early studies of Hackney, or those other seminaries in which the Editors and their brethren have received their education, I know not. But they seem generally unfortunate, when they venture upon classic ground. And indeed, it may be said, that whenever they wander beyond the range of such names as Priestley, and Evanson, and Lindsey, and Cappe, and Wakefield, who may be called the Unitarian Classics, they are almost always sure to meet with some mishap. *Ne sutor ultra crepidam*, is, in many cases, a wholesome suggestion.

* “*Alexandrini adhibent hanc vocem pro ריש, pauperem factum esse, indigere*”—“*ורש idem*”—“*et רלל ad inopiam redactus est.*” Schleusner refers to but four passages, in which the word occurs in the LXX: but there are six instances, including one in the Apocrypha: and, in *every one* of these, the word occurs, in the sense of a *transition*, from opulence to poverty, or from a state of possession to one of privation. In no other passages, except the one before us, is the word *πρωχέω* to be found throughout the whole of the sacred writings. The passages are Judges vi. 6. xiv. 15. Ps. xxxiv. 10. lxxix. 8. Prov. xxiii. 21. and Tobit iv. 21. In the first and fourth of these, the corresponding He-

ferent places in the sense of *being* MADE *poor*, and *being* REDUCED to *indigence*. How ignorant also must Suicer have been, who, in his translation of

brew word is שר, rendered *attenuor* by both Trommius and Biel, “*entirely exhausted*” by Parkhurst, and in the same sense by all the Lexicons; and this sense is indispensably requisite, from the context, in both the passages referred to. In the second, third, and fifth, we have the corresponding Hebrew word שר; which, in its general acceptation, signifies to REDUCE, or BE REDUCED TO, *extreme poverty*: and from the particular form of the verb as it occurs in these passages, as well as from the force of the context, it manifestly and unequivocally signifies the BEING MADE, OR BECOMING, *poor*. Jerome, who must be supposed tolerably acquainted with the force, both of the word *πταχυνω*, and of the original terms which the LXX have rendered by that word in these several passages, had used for it, in his translation of those passages taken in the order in which they have been cited, the following expressions, “*humiliatus est*”—“*spoliaretis nos*”—“*Divites egerunt*”—“*pauperes facti sumus*”—“*consumentur*”—in all of which, it is obvious, that this learned father and admirable critic, has conveyed the sense of a *change of condition*.

With respect to the sense, then, in which the verb *πταχυνω* has been employed by the LXX, in these several passages, we have the joint testimony of the original Hebrew, of Jerome’s translation, and of the unequivocal force of the context. To the remaining passage in the Apocryphal book of Tobit, we cannot apply the same accumulated evidence; because we are not possessed of the Hebrew or Chaldee original: and because, from whatever reason, the Vulgate translation of this book has, in such a variety of respects, so little accordance with the Greek text. But, yet, it is not less certain from the context, which relates entirely to the *change of condition* of the afflicted Tobit and his family, that the use of the word *πταχυνω*, here, is, as we have found it elsewhere; and that the rendering of the Received Version, *made poor*, is the true one.—Agreeably to what has been said of the verb in question, we find it rendered, in our common translation, in the sense of *being made poor*, or *becoming poor*, in every one of the passages which have been enumerated, excepting only in that of Psalm xxxiv: in which, by following the Hebrew literally, whilst it was viewed as figurative by the Greek translators, they have rendered the noun in the original by *Lions*, instead of *πλεστοι* or *the Rich*; and have, consequently been led to translate the verb by a word,

the following passages from Basil and Theophylact, has rendered the word, in like manner, most decisively in the sense of *becoming*, or *making one's self*, *poor*? “Ουτοι εισιν οι πτωχοι τω πνευματι, οτινες ου δι’ αλλην τινα αιτιαν επτωχευσαν, κ.τ.λ. Hi sunt pauperes spiritu, qui non aliam ullam ob causam *pauperes* FACTI SUNT, &c.—“πτωχους νοητεον τω πνευματι, τους παντων των εν κακια νοουμενων εκουσιως πτωχευσαντας, κ.τ.λ.—per pauperes spiritu intelligendi sunt, qui omnibus quæ sub malitiæ intellectum cadunt voluntarie SESE PRIVANT,” &c. (Thes. Eccles. vol. ii. pp. 888, 889.) [We have already seen, in the note at page 348, that this learned writer considers a *change of condition* to be implied in the very word πτωχος.]—Parkhurst also has betrayed

that does not necessarily imply a *change* of condition. At the same time, it should be observed, that Arias Montanus, looking always to the literal sense of the original, renders the verb here by *depauperati sunt*; although, like our English translators, he conceived himself bound to abide by the word *Lions*, with which that meaning of the verb but ill assorts. The marginal annotators of our Bible, also, by referring Luke i. 53. (“the hungry he hath filled with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away,” εξαπισταιλε κενους;) to this very passage of the 34th psalm, clearly mark their judgment of its true interpretation; and concur in the sense which is elsewhere uniformly given, by our English translators, to the verb πτωχεω. It may not be amiss to notice, that the only fragment of the later Greek Interpreters of the O. T. (Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus,) that remains to us, in which any instance occurs of the use of the verb πτωχεω, is one of Symmachus on Prov. xiii. 7: and in that, *beyond all possibility of question*, (both from the context and the force of the form *Hithpahel* in the original,) the *change of condition from rich to poor* is expressed. The verb is, indeed, used by Symmachus in the middle voice; but that merely gives it a *reciprocal* import; affecting only the *subject* of the action, not the nature of the act. Thus, then, we are provided with proof, as to the sense, in which the word πτωχεω was understood, by the Jewish Greek translators of the O. T. both before and after the age, in which the Gospels and Epistles were written.

similar ignorance by explaining the verb as signifying "to be, or *become*, poor."

Now, the Editors have recommended to their readers, as the best guides to the meaning of the Greek of the New Testament, the Lexicons of Schleusner, Suicer, Parkhurst, and Mintert. The last named I have not in my possession. But we see how far the remaining Lexicons justify the position, that the word $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ "*properly* signifies an actual state, and NOT *a change of state*." And we see also the reason, why the Editors have not, on the present occasion, resorted to *any one* of the Lexicons, which they have specially prescribed to the Student of the Greek Testament; but wander off to glean what they can, for their purpose, from the general Lexicons of Stephanus and Constantine;—why they turn also to Erasmus, for the very scanty pittance of his aid upon this subject; and travel (so as to equal the travellings of Ulysses himself) even into the Odyssey, for a favourable exposition of this untoward text. It has been seen, however, that Stephanus and Constantine, have been used, as Unitarian authorities generally are, and as we have found Mr. Wakefield treated upon the same subject, without any very scrupulous regard to what they themselves actually say: and that as to their *application* of the word $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$, so far from yielding the Editors support, these very names may actually be marshalled against them. As for the assistance, which, in their dearth of critical support, they labour to derive from Erasmus and Homer; the reader, after what has been said, will not find it difficult to appreciate *its* amount.

But we have that to appeal to, which on every question of this nature, is the most decisive criterion. The use of the Greek language among the Jews is properly to be learned from themselves:

and, from comparing Scripture Greek with itself, it has been at all times acknowledged, that we are most likely to arrive at the true acceptation of any word or phrase, in the Greek of either the New Testament or the Old. The verb *πτωχεω* occurs in no passage of the *N. T.* but that which is at present under consideration. In the writings of the *Old Testament*, including the Apocrypha, it occurs, as we have seen in a preceding note, in not less than six passages; in every one of which, it directly expresses, or obviously implies, that, which the Editors affirm it *cannot properly* signify, a *change* of state: it is applied, also, (as we have seen, p. 354. n.) in the same sense, by Symmachus, the only one of the later Greek interpreters of the Old Testament, whose use of it is to be found in the fragments of their Versions which remain to us: and Jerome, not only, (as has been noticed at p. 353. n.) confirms the use of the word, throughout the Old Testament, by his concurring interpretation of the corresponding Hebrew; but assigns to it, expressly, this signification, in his rendering of the word in the very passage, with which we are concerned, in the New: so that the use of the word *πτωχεω* in Jewish Greek, seems to be placed beyond question, and might be deemed sufficient,—even though in the *general* application of the word by Greek writers it were employed equally in the sense of BEING, and of BECOMING, *poor*,—to justify us in pronouncing, that in the latter sense exclusively it was understood among the Jews.

Of the justice of this remark, Stephanus, one of the principal authorities to which the Editors have appealed, affords a striking confirmation; for, although, in his general Lexicon, he had attributed to the word, a sense, that might be conceived to imply an actual state rather than a change of state;

yet, when he afterwards came to compile his Concordance for the New Testament, he confines the word, (as we have seen at p. 347.) specially to the signification of BECOMING *poor*. This too is the more marked and unequivocal, because, in the preface to his Concordance, he distinctly states, that it had been his particular care, when any word admits more interpretations than one, (meaning of course in its scripture application,) to assign them all: and yet to this he assigns the single interpretation, "*pauper* FIO." We see, then, how the *scripture* use of the word $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ appeared, even to those, who conceived, that, in its general signification, it was not to be confined to a change of state.

As to the scripture sense of the word $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$, we have a still higher authority than that of Stephanus, or of any modern scholar, however distinguished. The Syriac translators of the New Testament, must be allowed to be sufficient witnesses, as to the meaning of the Greek in use among their own countrymen in *their* day; which, by the confession of all, could not be far removed from the age of the Apostles. Now we have their authority, for asserting in the most decisive terms, that the word $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ is, in the passage before us, to be rendered in the sense of *being made*, or *becoming, poor*.*

* The Syriac translation of the word $\pi\tau\omega\chi\epsilon\upsilon\omega$ in 2 Cor. viii. 9. is ܥܡܬܠܐ; which, being in the conjugation *Ethpaal*, (corresponding to the Hebrew *Pyhal*,) puts the matter out of dispute, as to the meaning of the word, in the acceptation of the Syriac translators. Accordingly, we find the various Syriac Lexicons of Schindler, Trostius, Gutbirius, and Schaaf, interpreting this word in the most emphatical manner, *pauper* FACTUS EST. Indeed, it is to be remarked, that the particular verb, here employed in the Syriac, has no conjugation implying *pauper* fui, or the simple state of *being poor*; but always carries with it a *change of condition*; it being a quadriliteral, and from its nature and import wanting the conjugation *Peal*, and occur-

We have then, for this use of the word *πτωχευω* among Jewish writers, the authority of the LXX, of the Syriac translators of the New Testament, and of Symmachus. We have also the authority of Jerome. So that it seems to be placed almost beyond the possibility of doubt, that, with the Jewish writers, for a considerable period of time both preceding and following the date of St. Paul's Epistle, the word *πτωχευω* was familiarly employed in the sense of *being made*, or *becoming poor*. This is a sense of the word *admitted* by all Greek writers: the very derivation afforded by some Lexicons, attributing *even to its primitive* the force of a *change of condition*. But, whilst admissible in the general use of Greek writers, it seems to be the prevalent (*if not exclusive*) application of the *verb*, according to the usage of the Greek among the Jews. The ablest Greek scholars have adopted this application of the verb, in Jewish and Ecclesiastical Greek: even where they have explained the word generally, so as to admit, upon an equal footing, the sense ascribed to it by the Editors. Of this Suicer, Stephanus, and Schleusner afford striking examples. The authority of the first two, as to the scriptural and ecclesiastical use of the verb, has been noticed before. Schleusner we shall find, (in addition to what has been already adduced from him,) to be most explicit and decisive as to St. Paul's application of the verb in the passage before us.—“*δε' υμας*

ring in its earliest form in that of *Pael*, or in the sense of *depauperavit*: as the Chaldee, which agrees with the Syriac, applies the word *ܡܫܬܥܝܢ* in 1 Sam. ii. 7, and other places where the sense of a *change of condition* is inevitable.—This last named passage, indeed, furnishes perhaps the most decisive instance of the force of the two Syriac words *ܡܫܬܥܝܢ* and *ܡܫܬܥܝܢ*, and their corresponding Chaldee *ܡܫܬܥܝܢ* and *ܡܫܬܥܝܢ*; which are the words applied here to convey the Greek *πτωχιζει* and *πλεστιζει*, *makes rich*, and *makes poor*.—See p. 644.

ἐπὶ τῶν ἐσθλῶν, vestrum causâ in DETERIORI CONDITIONE in his terris vixit"—"vestrum causa PAUPER FACTUS EST."

In the same sense, that of a *change* of condition, we find almost every authority on the use of the verb in *this* passage, uniformly concurring. If we turn to the *English* translators, whether we take the *Rhemish*, or the authors of our own successive Versions, it is still the same. To satisfy the taste of Unitarians, we can produce the authorities even of Locke and of Wakefield. Not that I would class these two translators together, but as Wakefield is their own, and Locke they pretend to claim as such, it may be well to cite both at once for *their* satisfaction. By the former the word is here rendered, MADE HIMSELF *poor*; and by the latter, BECAME *poor*.

But what shall we say, if St. Paul himself expressly informs us of the sense in which he has used the word? And if, in a passage, which is (and must be) allowed by* all, to be exactly paral-

* That these two passages are exactly parallel, and mutually explanatory, is admitted by every commentator. That the correspondence must be forcible indeed, when it is conceded even by the Unitarians, will readily be granted. For, to put upon the passage in Philippians, such a construction, as will withdraw it from the support of Christ's divinity, is a task, that puzzles even those critics, who make little of the "natural signification of words:" and, therefore, it must be allowed to be rather a dangerous connexion for this text in 2 Corinthians, which they effect to say, when taken by itself, they can so easily get rid of. Yet Mr. Wakefield, in his Inquiry, (pp. 180. 181. 183.) insists largely upon "the exact correspondence" of the two passages; and contends, that they best "contribute to illustrate each other." Mr. Belsham, (Calm Inquiry, p. 139. Letters on Arian. p. 132, &c.) the Editors also, (Imp. Vers. p. 455.) and the other Unitarian writers connect them in like manner. It is to be observed, however, that in their mode of managing this, they conceive that they help their cause: the course which they pursue, being that of referring the passage of Philippians to that of 2 Corinthians; and thereby, as they ima-

lel to this, he has interpreted the verb for us by its equivalent, *εαυτον εκενωσε*, *he emptied himself?* *Emptied himself* of his former riches and glory,—

gine, reducing the stronger to the standard of the weaker. But they forget the principle of reaction: and, in their trepidation, (which, indeed, the text in Philipp. ii. 6. &c. may well be supposed to occasion to a Unitarian,) they altogether overlook the circumstance, that if the passage in Philippians is to be explained by that of 2 Corinthians, the passage of 2 Corinthians is also to be explained by that of Philippians. Well then, the matter is admitted on all hands, that from Philipp. ii. 5, 6. we have the best illustration of the passage before us; and, consequently, that by *πλουσις αν επτωχευσε*, is to be understood the same as *μορφη Θεου υπαρχων εαυτον εκενωσα*. And thus it appears, from St. Paul's self-explanation, that the RICHES of Christ were his *divine nature and supreme dominion over all things*; and that his POVERTY consisted in the *divesting himself* of that exalted character, and *humbling himself* to the low condition in which he appeared in this world. And, agreeably to this very form of words, in which St. Paul has thus explained himself in his Epistle to the Philippians, the Corinthians are again addressed by St. Paul's fellow-labourer Clement, in his Epistle to them, ch. xvi.—Τὸ σκήπτρον τῆς μεγαλειότης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκ ἤλθεν ἐν κομῷ αλαζονείας, οὐδὲ υπερηφάνειας, καίπερ δυναμένος. ἀλλὰ ταπεινοφρονων, [agreeing with the *ταπεινοφροσυνη* and *εταπεινωσεν* of the Apostle,] κ. τ. λ. "The Sceptre of the Majesty of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of pride and pre-eminence, although he might have done so; but in humility," &c. It deserves to be noted, that Jerome here reads, *καίπερ πάντα δυναμένος*; which reading, Russel (after Burton) maintains to be the true one:—*although possessing all power*. See Russel, Patr. Apost. i. 65. Thus, in every view we can take of the passage in question, we find the *change of condition* clearly and distinctly expressed; the *descent* of our Lord from a *superior* to an *inferior* state:—and thus every reference, by which the Unitarian hopes to relieve himself from his difficulties, only tends to make the matter worse.

It should be observed, that even Grotius, whom the Editors conceive to be an auxiliary to their cause, in their rendering of the text in 2 Corinthians, has supplied some criticisms, which are not altogether favourable to their translation. On Philipp. ii. 7. he says—"εαυτον εκενωσε. [Plane idem sensus qui 2 Cor. viii. 9. οτι δι υμῶν επτωχευσε πλουσις αν. Nam *inopes* dicuntur *κενοι*," &c.—"*εταπεινωσε εαυτον*]"—"sicut *εκενωσε*, ita *εταπεινωσε* formæ sunt Hiphil, sed significant talem se exhibere aut ostendere." Here is an

that glory which he had with the Father before the world began. No two passages in any writer can be conceived more pointedly to correspond, or to be more happily illustrative of each other, than these two passages of St. Paul. In both, our Saviour is presented as an example, in having voluntarily descended from a state of greatness to one of humiliation: and the object being to recommend liberality in the one case, and humility joined with brotherly love in the other, the Apostle describes the example, which our Lord had exhibited, in the terms appropriate to the respective subjects: *riches* and *poverty* being spoken of in the former, as *greatness* and *abasement* are in the latter; and as again we find the *ignominy of the cross* the topic selected in a third, where our Lord's example is pointed out as recommending to his followers *patience under*

admission, though a reluctant one, that *ἡπτάχενσι* signifies a *change of state*: inasmuch as it is pronounced to be precisely equivalent to *ἐκένωσεν*, which is admitted to be of the form of *Hiphil*, which indicates that change. This indeed he attempts to do away by what follows. But his criticism stands in opposition to his theology: and is itself sound, whatever may become of the latter. In truth, it is well known, that Grotius's comment upon this part of Scripture is condemned by every body. *Εὐμορφισμῶς ἀνθρώπων γενομένος*, he understands, as signifying Christ's being made like our first parents, in a state of innocence: than which, as Dr. Clarke observes, "nothing can be more unnatural."

It should be recollected, that Grotius's Annotations on the Epistles were not published till after his death:—so that, even though we could be sure, that they were fairly published, there is reason to conceive, that they contain many things undigested, and many that he might have altered had he lived to send the work to the press himself.—See Hammond on the title of 2 Peter, and J. Berriman's Moyer's Lecture, p. 329. Yet the authority of this unfinished and unauthenticated work, is what the Unitarians prefer to most others. It might be worth while to enquire, through what hands this posthumous publication passed to the press.

as well as the very nature of the subject, unequivocally evinces the Apostle's meaning to be, that, *by*

der the word *πλετω* in the very passage before us. There are also two places in the Apocrypha, Judith xv. 7. and Sirac. xi. 17. in which the verb *πλετω* occurs in the same sense: and there is scarcely a single passage in the Greek of the O. T. in which it is found in any other. See Schindler, also, for the use of the Chaldee *רַחַץ*, (the same as the Syriac *ܪܚܝܫ*) in the like sense every where. (See pp. 636, 637.) Jerome, likewise, has rendered the original word corresponding to *πλετω* in every one of the above passages, in the sense of *ditari*, *dives factus sum*. We, therefore, can, upon the whole, entertain no doubt, as to the prevalent meaning of the verb *πλετω* in the Greek of the Old Testament. But independently of the aid derived from this, we can have as little doubt of the use of it in the New: it being in every passage, besides the one in question, throughout the New Testament, wherever it occurs in its simply *verbal* state, employed in the same sense of *becoming*, or *being made rich*. See 1 Cor. iv. 8. Tim. vi. 9. 18. Apoc. iii. 17. 18. xviii. 3, 15. 19. in all of which, not only does the context clearly demand this sense, but we find it actually assigned in Jerome's translation. See Schleusner on the word. Stephanus, in translating the *πιστι πλετισας* of Nazianzen, renders "*dives factus sis*." That the Lexicons generally explain the word by *dives sum*, as well as by *ditesco*; and that the word, in its general application, signifies *to be*, as well as *to become rich*,—there can be no question. At the same time it should be observed, that the significations assigned to the word by Constantine, in his Lexicon, are "*ditari*, *locupletari*, *dives evado*, *dives sum*: so that, in the judgment of this writer, it should seem, that the more frequent acceptation of the word is *to become rich*. But, whether this be so or not, we have seen from numerous instances, that the prevalent use of the word in *Scripture* Greek, is in this acceptation undoubtedly: and that it should be so in the New Testament especially, in its figurative application to Christian acquisitions, is most natural; since the whole language of the Gospel bespeaks a *change of human condition*, wrought by our Lord's appearance amongst men. In the verse before us, this meaning of the word is decidedly marked among other considerations, from its connexion through the 7th verse with 1 Cor. i. 5. in which, as already noticed, the verb *επλουτισθητε* expresses the *change of condition*, beyond the possibility of cavil. Indeed on this sense of the verb, here, all commentators seem agreed.

the poverty of Christ, they, to whom he addressed himself, were *enriched*. Two cotemporary states cannot here be pretended. It would be absurd to say, that it is meant, that, *while, or during the time that, our Lord was poor, they continued rich*. It must be, and it is, admitted, that to be *enriched, or made rich*, is what is here expressed: and that *by* that state, in which our Lord was placed, and which is denominated *poverty*, they were placed in that state which is denominated *rich*. They were brought, then, into that state, from one that differed from it: they were brought into a state of riches, from a state of poverty. The transition, therefore, *from poverty to riches*, being distinctly conveyed in the latter clause; that *from riches to poverty*, is as clearly marked in the former. Mr. Wardlaw, whose services in the cause of Christian truth, are highly valuable, thus justly represents it. "A transition is expressed, on the part of Jesus, a *voluntary transition*, from a state of infinite glory and riches, to a state of debasement and poverty; in order to a transition on the part of his people, from a state of wretched degradation and poverty, to the possession of true honour and of excellent and durable riches." (Discourses, &c. pp. 159, 160.)

Here, then, is the true, and natural, and satisfactory, view of the passage before us. The Apostle, being desirous to excite the liberal feelings of the Corinthians towards their needy brethren, and to do this upon principles worthy of the followers of Christ, naturally places before them the example of the divine benevolence of their heavenly master. If Christ emptied himself of his heavenly abundance and glory, to supply your spiritual wants, and make you rich in that which is the true riches; will not you part even with some of your worldly wealth, to supply the temporal wants of your poor and af-

fllicted brethren. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty, might be made rich." I have here adopted the translation of the English Bible, which was superseded by the Version in present use,* as giving more accurately the force of the original, which indeed it will be found upon examination to do in many other passages.

Should any objection be made, here, to the use of the word "THOUGH," as not being expressly marked in the original; at the same time that this objection must be ascribed to the influence of theological prepossession, rather than of Greek criticism; yet, to remove every scruple, be it admitted, that the literal translation, *Being rich*, should be adhered to. What advantage do Unitarian critics expect to derive from this? It is manifest, that, although they commend this simple rendering of the participle, they conceive it not altogether safe to rest upon it. *Laudatur et alget.* *Though he was rich* is a wrong rendering, say Mr. Wakefield, Mr. Belsham, &c. the words are strictly, *BEING rich*: and therefore we will render them—what? not, *BEING rich*, but *WHILE he was rich*. This however will not do. The thrusting out "THOUGH," on the pretence, that *BEING rich* is the true translation; and then slipping in "WHILE" in place of it, is but a clumsy sort of legerdemain. No, let us abide by something steadily: and let us suppose with the Unitarians, that *BEING rich* is the just translation. What follows from this? Simply

* The old rendering by Wiclif is perhaps not inferior to any.—And ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, for he was made needy for you when he was rich, that ye should be made rich by his neediness—"and ghe witen the grace of oure lord issus crist, for he was maad nedi for ghou whanne he was riche, that ghe schulden be maad riche bi his nedynesse."

that *at the time when* our Lord made himself poor, he *was* rich: so that (as we have already remarked at p. 336—338.) “a passage from a preceding state of wealth to a succeeding state of poverty,” seems to be as strongly expressed, as it is by the form of the present Received Version.

But, if it be attempted still to insist, (in opposition to the well-known usage of the language) upon the impropriety of applying the word *ων* to *past* time, and to contend for its necessary application in the case before us to *continued being*; let the Unitarian take the full advantage, of the still closer approximation of this text to that of Philippians, by the more perfect agreement of ΩΝ with the force of ΥΠΑΡΧΩΝ, and the more emphatical designation* of the *nature* and *subsistence* of Christ; namely, that *being in his nature* rich, he became poor, &c. If these new light expositors will have the matter thus, it cannot be helped. The other parts of the sentence they cannot possibly shake. They may add strength by this buttress, if they will.—I shall now lay before the reader a note upon the passage, extracted from one of those Commentators, to whom the Unitarians are sometimes desirous to appeal. *Rosenmuller* says, on this 9th verse of 2 Cor.—“*Quod quum esset rerum omnium Dominus ditissimus, i. e. beatitate abundatissimus, tamen propter*

* Dr. Middleton says, “I know not, indeed, whether *υπαρχων* may not be rendered PRE-EXISTING; for *Suidas*, edit. Kust. vol. iii. p. 532. observes, το υπαρχειν εκ απλης το ειναι σημαίνει, αλλα το παλαι ειναι, και ΠΡΟΕΙΝΑΙ φθανειν.”—Doct. of the Greek Art. pp. 538. 539.—*Diodati*, in his admirable translation, uses the same word *essendo*, both for *ων* and for *υπαρχων*. He, like other commentators, refers 2 Cor. viii. 9. to Phil. ii. 6. &c. for fuller explanation: and in his illustration of *essendo in forma di Dio*, &c. in the latter, he says, “possedeva quella gloria divina, come sua propria di natura, essendo uguale in ogni cosa al Padre in verità, e di ragione eterna.”

vos in maxima paupertate vixit in his terris, ut ejus paupertate divites fieretis, i. e. etsi poterat esse beatissimus, quippe filius Dei, tamen multas calamitates pertulit, ut felices fieretis, et omnibus bonis cumularemmini. In verbis *πλουσιος ων* ponitur species felicitatis, intelligitur autem omnis felicitas. Non enim Christus ullo tempore fuit dives, ut nos divites pecuniis dicimur.—*Fuit autem beatitate abundatissimus priusquam in has terras adspectabilis venit.* Sic etiam *paupertate* Christi omnis ejus humilitas et vita ærumnarum plena est intelligenda. Hæc enim, Deo ita volente, salutis nostræ causa facta est.”—*Schleusner* is another authority, to whom these writers frequently pretend to refer. How does *he* explain this passage?—“*οτι δι υμας επτωχευσε, πλουσιος ων, qui vestrum causa pauper FACTUS EST, cum TAMEN esset ipsi facultas, rebus omnibus pro arbitrio utendi, rerumque omnium dominium; seu, cum TAMEN esset felicissimus et beatissimus. Intelligitur autem ibi δοξα illa, quam Christus AB ÆTERNO habuisse apud Deum DISERTE IN N. T. TRADITUR*”—“*ινα υμεις τη εκεινου πτωχεια πλουτησητε, ut vos ejus paupertate et humili statu et conditione redderemini participes felicitatis Christianorum.*”*

* *Locke* has given no explanatory note, but he has rendered the passage in a manner, that supports the Received Version decidedly against the Unitarian reading—“*who, being rich, made himself poor for your sake, that you, by his poverty, might become rich.*”—It is manifest, that the Editors receive but little countenance in any quarter, for their novel and inconsistent interpretation of the text. Perhaps there is no more satisfactory explanation given of the several parts of the verse than that which has been given by *Diodati*.—“*Rich, [in the possession of perfect happiness and glory in his divine nature. He became,] he hath taken upon him our nature with all the miseries, wants, and obligations, Phil. ii. 7, to gain for you the treasures of God’s grace, righteousness and eternal life.*” And agreeable to this is his accurate translation—“*che voi conosciate la gratia del Signor nostro Jesu Christo; cice, ch’ egli,*

Thus we see, that, as to the passage before us, we have every circumstance, that can determine a mind capable of forming a sound judgment, in favour of the sense which has been ascribed to it in our common Version: the meaning of the words, the force of the context, the turn of the reasoning, the comment supplied by a parallel passage of the same writer, the authority of the Versions, the judgment of the ablest critics. We have all. But then this sense lets in the PRE-EXISTENCE of Christ: and therefore it *cannot* be the true one. Make what havoc you will, of language, and context, and reasoning, and authorities, the thing *cannot be*. Another sense must be devised: and another translation, though it be such as was never heard or thought of for near 1800 years, must be contrived, so as to exclude the obnoxious meaning; and to satisfy Mr. Belsham's man of "sound understanding and honest mind," (who, not inconveniently, may be destitute of all information upon these subjects,) that the true interpretation of the Apostle, is such as would *equally prove the pre-existence of every person who was a miser*, as that of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. (See *Calm Inq.* p. 122.)

But now, the absurd notion of our Lord's pre-existence being completely shut out by this newly discovered version of the passage, how is the real meaning and application to be rendered intelligible, to the "sound understanding and honest mind" of this unbiassed and uninformed arbiter of Scripture truth?—"Ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, that while he was rich, yet for your sakes he lived in poverty, that through his poverty ye might be rich."—Rich in what? "Rich

essendo ricco, s'è fatto pouero per voi; accioche voi arricchiste per la sua pouertà."

in miraculous powers, which he *could employ if he pleased to* HIS OWN ADVANTAGE. But for the benefit of his followers he chose to lead a life of POVERTY AND INDIGENCE," &c. (Imp. Vers. p. 416.) We see then that the *riches* of our Lord consisted in his *power of having riches*, by which he might have secured himself against *poverty*, and have lived a *rich man*, richer even than the richest of the Corinthians. And this the Editors follow up, by remarking, that "this was a very proper example to the Corinthians, which they might feel and imitate." Undoubtedly it was.—Our Saviour gave up *his riches*, (RICHES, it appears here, in the *literal sense*,) and therefore the Corinthians ought to give up *theirs*. The example goes farther. Our Lord gave up his riches for the benefit of others: the Corinthians were now to do the same.

This is all correct and natural. *Riches* are literally spoken of throughout the entire passage, and the example consequently becomes much "more pertinent and applicable than a supposed descent from a prior state of existence and felicity, to which there could be nothing analogous in the case of the Corinthians:" the Corinthians not having on their part descended from any such state. Still, however, one difficulty, I fear, must hang upon the mind of the man of "sound understanding:" for we have hitherto entirely forgotten (after the example of the Editors,) one important clause of the sentence: we have forgotten to explain how, it was, that *through our Lord's poverty the Corinthians were to be rich*. Were they to gain the riches which our Lord declined to use? Or how were they to be rendered wealthy by his poverty? According to the interpretation of the *Editors*, the *riches*, which they *derived* from our *Lord's poverty*, they were called on to impart to their indigent brethren, so

as to diminish the evils of *their poverty*. The whole is quite intelligible,—if, indeed, the Editors would be but kind enough to add the one trifling circumstance of explanation, to which we have alluded; namely, in what manner our Saviour's want of riches swelled the coffers of the Corinthians. Here, however, Mr. Belsham supplies the deficiency of his brother Editors. He informs his man of "sound understanding;" that, although *riches* were spoken of *literally*,* in the *first* clause, with respect to our

* This writer has not actually used the word "*literal*" as applied to *riches* in this clause, but the whole train of his reasoning pronounces the word for him.—Dr. Carpenter speaks of the expression as "*almost literal*." ALMOST LITERAL! Does he mean by this, something that is neither figurative nor literal? Perhaps it may bear explanation. The truth is, the matter is rather puzzling to the Unitarian commentator. He knows not well what to make of this clause. He cannot say, in strictness, that the word "*rich*" is *literally* employed here, and he is unwilling to admit expressly that it is *figurative*. The thing is, accordingly, huddled up, in such a way, as to leave on the mind of the reader the general impression of a literal application, although it is not actually asserted. This sort of application is, I suppose, what Dr. Carpenter intends, when he speaks of it as "*almost literal*." (Unit. the Doct. &c. p. 232.) And I have, accordingly, spoken of the application of the word by the Unitarian writers, as *literal*, because their argument requires that they should be so understood. But the truth is, that their *real* application of the word "*rich*" in the first clause, (let them call it *almost literal*, or what they will,) is decidedly *figurative*. "*Rich in miracles*," (even though such miracles alone were here intended as might create *literal riches*,) is still to be *figuratively* "*rich*." And, consequently, the Unitarian version of this passage is fairly exposed to the following judicious animadversion. "The plain reader—even admitting him to think with the Unitarian Editor, that our Lord was rich and poor *at the same time*, still would conclude, that the adjectives *rich* and *poor* were applied to our Saviour's condition in a sense directly and literally *opposite* to each other. This passage then, taken in this obvious sense, would clearly point out to him the two-fold character of the person to whom it referred, as the *Son of God*, the Creator and great Proprietor of all things; and the *Son of Man*, 'as hav-

Lord; (and properly so, because riches and the imparting of them form the entire subject of the Apostle's address;) yet they were not intended literally, in the *second* clause, with respect to the Corinthians. We are told by Mr. Belsham, here, of what "the connexion requires." We now find, that, although hitherto we ought naturally to use the word *rich* in a *literal* sense; we shall *here* fall into downright absurdity, unless we drop that sense of the word immediately. Mr. Belsham informs us, that in this place, the word should "be taken in a *figurative* sense: rich in faith, in holiness, in benevolence, and in the promises and blessings of the Gospel:"—in every thing, in short, but what he and his brother Editors had hitherto contended must be signified by the word.

But here, Mr. Belsham's man of "sound understanding no where to lay his head.' For certainly, it would not occur to the plain reader, that the Apostle meant to describe our Saviour as at the same time *rich in miracles*, and *poor in condition*; for this would be to make the Apostle, without any apparent reason, write *figuratively* and *literally* of the same person in the same sentence; an incongruous mode of writing, calculated to lead into error." See page 55 of the Archdeacon of Sarum's Charge, June, 1815:—a publication, containing, in addition to much valuable matter on other subjects, some remarks of distinguished judgment and force on the Unitarian method of interpreting the Scriptures. To what has been here so justly observed in this passage, much need not be added. It may be sufficient to say, that not only would it never occur to any plain and unsophisticated understanding, that "*rich*" and "*poor*" were in this clause applied to our Lord in reference to *different* subjects, or that they were not directly and literally *opposed* to each other; but it is manifest, that it would never occur to such an understanding, that *miracles*, which are never once mentioned or alluded to in the most remote degree, could have been intended here under the word "*rich*." In truth, a new revelation would be requisite, to satisfy any man of "sound understanding," that such was the reference of the expression. And yet, it is to a person of this description, that the Unitarian critics profess their willingness here and elsewhere to appeal.

standing" may possibly recollect, that he had been assured by the *Calm Inquirer*, and his brother Editors, again and again, that literal and figurative acceptations of the same word are not to be admitted in the same sentence; that "good writers do not in grave discourse capriciously change the meaning of words," &c. and that, upon this very principle of interpretation, he had been already pressed by Mr. B. and the *Editors*, to part with many texts, in which the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence seemed to be clearly expressed. (See *Calm Inq.* p. 50, &c. also p. 370—373 of this volume.) But, then, it is manifest, that, unless this canon be relinquished in *this* place, the whole of this new translation of the sentence would become unintelligible, and must consequently be given up; and then, the doctrine of the *pre-existence* necessarily comes in; which, the man of sound understanding" *must* know, *cannot* be true. Well then; the word, of course, *must* be figurative in this clause. How goes on the explanation now? How could our Saviour's want of *literal* wealth make his followers *figuratively* rich! How was the circumstance of our Lord's being *poor*, to make them *holy*? This again puts the man of "sound understanding" to a stand.

But here, also, there is a ready explanation for him. It was not the mere poverty, but the voluntary submission to that poverty; the example of fortitude and self denial, in relinquishing the riches which he enjoyed (potentially) in his miraculous powers. He possessed the power of working miracles at his pleasure, he had, as Mr. Lindsey and Mr. Belsham express it, "all nature at his command, and could supply every want." *Calm Inq.* p. 126. How is this, replies the man of "sound understanding?" You have said elsewhere, (p. 447,) that Christ "was a *man*, constituted in *all respects* like

other men, subject to the same infirmities, the same ignorance, prejudices and frailties :” and yet you now say, that he had “all nature at his command.” But so far from having “all nature at his command,” has not Dr. Priestley, one of your greatest luminaries, already satisfied all “RATIONAL CHRISTIANS” of “sound understanding,” that the power of working miracles was not inherent in our Lord : that he merely “spoke the word, or used some indifferent action, (such as anointing the eyes of the blind man,) and God produced the effect ;” that, in the supposed working of the miracle by Christ or any other prophet,” all that was “necessary as a proof of their divine mission,” was, that they “should be able to foretell what God would do, (which, in fact, is all they pretended to,)” and that, in truth, Christ, no more than any other of the prophets, had the smallest power of himself, to work any miracle.

In this view of the case, (which indeed seems the only consistent one for a Unitarian,) it becomes unavoidable to enquire, how any particular power can be said to have been given to our Lord, which he did not actually display ; or rather, as Dr. Priestley would more correctly put it, how he could foretell, that things would be done through him, which, in fact, it did not please God should be done ? The “power of feeding the multitude—of causing the miraculous draught of fishes,” &c. which God deemed necessary for the proof of his mission, was of course permitted to him. But if God did not deem the power of “supplying himself and his friends with all the comforts, the conveniences, and the elegancies of life,” (*Calm Inq.* p. 126.) necessary for the proof of our Lord’s mission, and therefore, *did not* bestow upon him this power, of course he could not have had such a power. It follows, then

that he was *not* RICH; he had not the miraculous power of making wealth; he had not, like the "*miser*," his hidden coffers: he was literally *poor*, and could not be otherwise. How, then, did his *poverty* make his followers *holy*? The puzzle still continues. If our Lord had not his miraculous powers inherent in his nature, but was merely enabled to connect some act of his with the miracle wrought by a power not his own; or rather, to declare beforehand, that such miracle would be wrought; we cannot admit the possibility of any miracle being wrought through his instrumentality, which was not actually so wrought. In this case, we can only know what could be, from what has been.

The consequences from this view of the subject, being fatal to the exposition of the passage given us by the Editors, the modern race of Unitarians find it necessary to abandon it altogether. Mr. Belsham, and Mr. Lindsey inform us, on the contrary, (as we have already remarked,) that our Lord "*had all nature at his command.*" (Calm Inq.* p.

* Mr. Belsham has, in this same page, described our Lord as, "*rich in miraculous powers, which it was at his option to employ for his own benefit*"—an assertion, which we have already seen at p. 369. has likewise been made by the Editors. The remarks of a judicious writer, on this passage, contain so much intrinsic value, that I cannot deny the reader the satisfaction of perusing them in his own words.—"*Miraculous powers, which it was at his option to employ for his own benefit!* What a strange supposition is this! A prophet of the Most High, with miraculous, that is, with almighty power, at his own disposal, to use as he may incline, for promoting his own wealth, and honour, and aggrandizement! Divine power transferred to a creature! subjected to the will and pleasure of a *mere man!*"—"Such transference of Divine power, I would, in the first place, remark, is a natural impossibility. The might which effects the miracle, resides in God alone. It never can belong to the creature. And residing, as it must, in God alone, it can never be exerted to gratify the will of a creature, who would pervert

126.) And Mr. Belsham again, (at pp. 174, 175, 176.) states, that he possessed a voluntary power of working miracles," without "being prompted by

it to a selfish purpose, or to any purpose different from that which he is commissioned to accomplish, and for the accomplishment and vindication of which alone, the interposition of the power is pledged. The contrary supposition is pregnant with consequences the most serious and fatal. *It destroys the certainty of the evidence of miracles*, and thus subverts one of the main pillars on which the truth of Christianity rests. For, if miraculous power was entirely a *discretionary* power, lodged in the hands and placed at the will of its possessor, to be used for any purpose he pleased; then, what security have we, that it has, in *every* instance, been used agreeable to the design for which it was bestowed?—*always* in support of truth, and *never* of error?—*always* for the accomplishment of Divine, and *never* of selfish ends? The very expression, that it was '*at his option*' how he should employ this power,—at the option of a man like ourselves, subject to the perverting influence of human infirmities and human passions,—supposes the *possibility* of the one, as well as of the other: and thus a miracle, however fully ascertained, ceases to be a *conclusive evidence* of truth, or a certain indication of the Divine will." Wardlaw's Discourses, pp. 50, 51.—These admirable reflections, of a sound judgment, and a reasoning mind, present such a view of a *discretionary*, or *optionary* power of working miracles, as must render it impossible for any one, who *really* possesses a "sound understanding," to conceive a mere human being invested with such a power. Mr. Belsham, however, (as we see above) claims such a power for our Lord; and, as to the danger of its being perverted under any circumstances in which our Lord could be placed; *that*, he thinks, was completely guarded against by the discipline which our Lord underwent from THE TEMPTATION. (Calm Inq. p. 174.) From this, it appears, our Lord had acquired an *unerring discretion*, which secured the certainty of the exercise of such vast "powers only upon proper occasions."

The *wilderness*, it must be observed, stands, with the modern Socinians, in the place of the *heaven*, into which, according to the old Socinians, our Lord was taken up after his baptism. If we ask, where our Lord received those divine communications, the acquisition of which is, (as these critics inform us) what is intended, by his *ascending up to heaven*, we are told by some of them, it was *in the wilderness*: in which our Lord *fancied*

any divine suggestion:" for, that, had it not been so, there could have been "no room for the exercise either of discretion or benevolence." Thus

himself transported into Heaven. (Calm Inq. p. 42.) If again we ask, how our Lord, being supposed a mere man, could be secured against the possible misapplication of those vast miraculous powers, which were entirely and absolutely at his own disposal, we are again sent to *the wilderness*: where, we are informed, as we have just seen, that he was duly disciplined for this purpose by his temptation. (See also Calm Inq. p. 449.) It happens very fortunately for the Unitarians, that the *wilderness* presents a considerable portion of unoccupied space, over which they may spread, as many as they please, of those imagined transactions, which the furnishing out of their scheme may require, without the slightest interference from the Evangelical historians. At the same time, as these critics have objected, in opposition to the old Socinian notion of the ascent of our Lord into heaven after his baptism, that no such event has been recorded by the Evangelists, or appears to have been heard of or believed by early Christians, (see Calm Inq. p. 43.) may we not reasonably enquire of Mr. Belsham and his associates, in which of the Gospels, or in what writings of early Christians, we may find related, the circumstance of our Lord's having been *disciplined by his temptations in the wilderness*, so as to prevent him from abusing the miraculous powers, with which he was entrusted.

But surely, if after all, Mr. Belsham can no better sustain the idea of an *absolute* and *perfectly optionary* power of working miracles possessed by a mere human being, than by the additional consideration of a certain discipline (in the wilderness) being sufficient to secure *such a being* against the possible abuse of *such a power*: he needed not to have been at the trouble of fabricating such history, to support such philosophy. For, even admitting gratuitously to Mr. Belsham, both the history and the philosophy: admitting that a discipline *was* administered in the wilderness to guard our Lord against a wilful abuse of his miraculous powers; and admitting, that such discipline must suffice to secure a mere human being, a creature of passions and infirmities, against the possibility of an intentional misapplication of those powers: what was there to guard against their *erroneous* exercise, in a being labouring under the "ignorance and prejudices" of human nature? For how stands the case respecting the *knowledge* of our Lord? *Naturally*, (Mr. Belsham informs us) our Lord was *subject to the very same*

we see, that Dr. Priestley, who for a certain time was looked up to as THE INFALLIBLE of the English Unitarians, is now given up as having gone too far. He, like a true "RATIONAL CHRISTIAN," had followed his own principles fairly on to their legitimate results. He saw, that having represented Christ as a mere man, like in all respects to any other man, he could not consistently allow to him the entire dominion over the works of nature, so as to be able

infirmities, ignorance and prejudices as other men: (Calm Inq. p. 447.) and *supernaturally*, he was instructed only so far, "as was necessary for the execution of his commission, that is, for the revelation and proof of the doctrine of eternal life, and that the favour of God extended to the Gentiles equally with the Jews;"—so that when he has delivered opinions upon subjects unconnected with the object of his mission, such opinions and his reasonings upon them, are to be received with the same attention and caution with those of other persons in similar circumstances," &c. (pp. 451, 452.) The same writer again informs us, (p. 472.) that "it no more derogates from the authority of Christ, than it does from that of Moses, that his inspiration should not extend beyond the proper objects of his mission, and that in *other cases* he should entertain the *same opinions*, and be liable to the same misconceptions, as his countrymen, and those amongst whom he was educated." These, also, Mr. Belsham informs us, are the opinions held and avowed by Unitarians at large. What then follows on the principles here laid down? Our Lord's *inspiration was restricted*, whilst his *power of working miracles was unlimited*. On all subjects, but those connected with the doctrine of a future life, and the calling in of the Gentiles jointly with the Jews, he was *equally* liable to error and prejudice with other men. But upon *all* subjects, it was in his power to work miracles, in attestation of his truth and of his knowledge. He had the power then of giving divine attestation to human error. And against this misapplication of his miraculous powers, even the *discipline of the wilderness* furnishes no security: because *that* discipline is only contended for as in counteraction to *wilful* abuse; but it is of the nature of error to be unconscious of itself. Thus the Unitarian philosophy, by its separation of knowledge from power, would subvert the evidence of miracles, and enlist even omnipotence itself in the possible support of falsehood.

at his own will and pleasure, to suspend and alter the laws of the material creation. He, therefore, made our Lord the mere instrument of the divine power, and left nothing of miracles to his own volition. This answered the purpose of Unitarians, so long as they were content to flourish away upon mere *rational principles* as they called them. But, so soon as their evil genius tempted them to turn expounders of Scripture, they found that this legitimate result of their system was no longer tenable. They found it overwhelmingly contradicted by numerous and decisive texts. And not being prepared to eject these texts altogether as spurious;—having discovered no early heretic, in whose copy of the N. T. they were said to be wanting; nor any German Theologue, who had expressed a conjuncture that *possibly* they were not genuine;—they were obliged to abandon Dr. Priestley, and their own system, and to contend for a power, possessed by a mere ordinary human being, not inferior to that which belongs to the great Author of nature himself; the power of suspending and altering the laws of nature.

In truth, it seems most unaccountable, how a *Unitarian* could be led to so momentous an admission, as that our Lord “HAD ALL NATURE AT HIS COMMAND.” It will be difficult for him, under such an admission, to escape from the monstrous absurdity, which he charges upon the Arian, of a *Greater God and a Lesser*: an absurdity, on which he contrives to fasten others not inferior, of his own manufacture; one of which is, that the lesser God was to exercise his universal dominion over nature, was to possess his omnipotence, but for a limited and short portion of time: not much more than the space of one year, if we are to take Mr. Belsham’s account of our Lord’s ministry. (Calm. Inq. p. 449.) And,

what makes the whole of this extraordinary admission of the Unitarian the more extraordinary, is, that it is intended for the purpose of *diminishing* the rank of that being, to whom such vast and divine power is ascribed: the admission of this power, being, in some cases, the only means, whereby the language of Scripture, announcing the *pre-existence* of our Lord, can possibly be evaded. And thus, for the purpose of proving, that *pre-existence* is not to be attributed to our Lord, and for the further purpose of thence inferring that he was *not more than man*, they contend for his possessing that which makes him *not less than God*: they contend also, for his possessing this, under circumstances, which might permit him, to give the stamp of *divine attestation to human error*. Upon the whole, I fear, that the man of "sound understanding," will find himself most sadly bewildered, by the *clear and satisfactory* explanations of Unitarian critics: and that he will ultimately be led to suspect, that they are creating more mysteries* in the world of reason, than the most determined orthodox had ever contended for in the world of grace.

Although the remarks upon the Unitarian treatment of this text, have already run to a length far

* Dr. Young has truly pronounced of the Socinians, that they "have been most unfortunate in the execution of their main design: for" (he adds,) "they have not purged MYSTERY out of the Scripture, they have only changed its place; they have taken mystery out of the *doctrine* of Scripture, where it was venerable, and worthy of the majesty of God, and have placed it in the *phrase* of Scripture, where it is opprobrious and repugnant to God's sincerity." (Sermons, vol. ii. p. 78.)—In truth, the Socinians seem, at all times, to have had a pleasure in making *mysteries*, in whatever is in its own nature *unmysterious*, such as *reason and language*; but, in that, which *must be mysterious to man*, as being placed beyond his comprehension, namely the *DIVINE NATURE*, they will not allow *any mystery*, not even on the testimony of God himself.

beyond what to many may appear requisite; yet I cannot refuse a word or two to the same subject, as connected with the Unitarian exposition of the corresponding passage in Philipp. ii. 6. ‘*Being in the form of God,*’ is there represented, as ‘*being rich*’ was here, the “being invested with miraculous power;” (I. V. and Calm. Inq. p. 143.) and *εαυτον εκενωσε* in that place is, like *επτωχευσε* in this, the “divesting himself of” that form of God, i. e. *of those miraculous powers*, in which that *form* consisted. (Ibid.) That is, says the I. V. and Mr. Belsham, Christ “did not absolutely relinquish his miraculous powers, but submitted to indignity and crucifixion, *as though* he were destitute of power to help himself:” or, as Mr. B. states it, “when the purposes of his mission required it, he conducted himself *as though* he were totally destitute of all supernatural gifts.” These writers, it is to be observed, have been most careful to inform us, that the expression in this text is extremely strong—he “EMPTIED *himself*”—“he EXHAUSTED *himself*, parted with all without retaining any thing”—“he DIVESTED *himself* of EVERY THING that is intended by the form and likeness of God.” (See Calm Inq. pp. 138. 139.) But, at the same time, we are taught to recollect, that our Lord did not *absolutely relinquish* that, of which he had thus *totally* EMPTIED, and EXHAUSTED, and DIVESTED *himself*. The man of “sound understanding” is informed, that, although the Apostle has declared, that our Lord had divested himself of certain powers, he only appeared *as though* he had done so; but that, in reality, he had *not* divested himself of any, but possessed them secretly all the while: just as before, he seemed *as though* he was poor, at the very time when he possessed an unknown hoard of riches. Thus our Lord most miraculously appears, to have been *really invested with*, and *really divested*

of, the *same* powers, at *one and the same* moment of time. "WHILE *he was poor he was rich*," both I. V. and Mr. Belsham chaunt forth here again as clearing up all. (I. V. p. 455. *Calm Inq.* p. 139.)

Moreover, these critics take prodigious pains to satisfy us, that this "*form of God*," had nothing to do with an *internal nature* or essence; but simply consisted in an *external appearance*, a *resemblance*. This resemblance, also, they apprize us, consisted in the exercise of miraculous powers. What then follows? Our Lord, in not exercising those miraculous powers, divested himself of that resemblance; but at the same time CONTINUING *in the form of God*, he still retained that resemblance: so that, during the time, in which he continued to bear a resemblance to God, he was all along destitute of any such resemblance. *Μορφή*, the *form*, signifies only *quod in oculos incurrit*, an *appearance to the sight*:—this Mr. Belsham adopts from Grotius and others; and enlarges upon it, (*Calm Inq.* p. 132,) and, then, we are told by him and his brother Editors, that the true construction of the passage in Philippians is, that *this appearance was to continue whilst nothing appeared*. This, again, is prepared for the man of "sound understanding" to swallow as he can. On this text Mr. Belsham has expended seventeen close and heavy pages: and, after great labour both of Metaphysics and Philology, (*such* Metaphysics and *such* Philology as fall to the lot of a *certain* tribe of writers,) he has brought the whole matter to this single point.

On the text itself, it will be observed, I have offered no remark tending to enforce its true interpretation. This, had it even fallen within my plan would have been altogether superfluous. The ample consideration bestowed upon this important passage, by Commentators of the greatest ability

and learning, has long ago placed it beyond the reach of Socinian criticism; and has established, on such grounds as cannot be shaken, its direct announcement of the *pre-existence* and *divinity* of our Lord: and, as for the absurd attempts of *modern* Unitarians to disturb the true application of the text, these have been so recently and so ably exposed by Dr. Nares and the Bishop of St. David's, (to whom no reply has yet been attempted,) that any further observation upon them must be useless. Simply to state the result of their own exposition and their own arguments, I have deemed sufficient for their refutation. This, indeed, will be found generally, to be the case, with respect to these Critics. And, in truth, with regard to the text before us, especially, were it desired to confirm any one, who had doubts as to its genuine import, a better plan could not be devised, than to induce him, (if he really were a person of "sound understanding.") to peruse the Unitarian arguments against it, especially as they are detailed by Mr. Belsham: who winds up the most incoherent and self-contradictory jumble, that ever passed under the name of criticism, with an assertion, (which, surely, can be viewed in no other light than as a jocular experiment upon his reader,)—that THIS "is one of those passages, of which *no use can be made* in deciding the controversy," concerning the divinity of Christ.—*Literæ non erubescunt*, is an old saying. There are things which a man may write, which he could not easily command countenance to say.

The reader, however, will not fail to recollect, that this is one of the most important passages, throughout the New Testament, on the question of our Lord's *divinity*. He will not fail to recollect, also, that the text in 2 Corinthians, which forms the subject of the present Number, is by universal con-

sent, identified with this passage in its import; and that the fate of each is, particularly by the Unitarians, conceived to be involved in that of the other. And he will, above all, not fail to recollect, that, in a text of such unquestionable moment in the controversy with Unitarians, the Editors of the Imp. Vers. have departed from Archbishop Newcome's translation, in a laboured form of phrase, which, as they think, (and struggle at much length to prove,) *excludes the idea of pre-existence*; and that, of this departure, they have not thought it necessary to give the slightest notice.

We come now to Number VI. in which we find not only a total departure from the Primate's translation, but an actual fabrication of Scripture. For the comparison of the two versions, I refer the reader to page 244 of this volume. The first clause in the Imp. Vers. is, as we have there quoted, "See that ye refuse not *God* who speaketh;" whilst the Primate renders it, "See that ye refuse not him who speaketh." The Greek is, *Βλεπετε, μη παραιτησησθε τον λαλουντα*. Now, the first thing to be observed here is, that neither in Newcome's translation, nor in the Greek, does the word "GOD" occur. Griesbach does not notice a single MS. or Version that contains the word "GOD," or that makes the slightest alteration in the Greek text here given, with the unimportant exception of the addition of the word *υμων* after *λαλουντα* in one or two MSS. and Versions. Griesbach and Newcome are the two great standards, to which the Editors *profess* to adhere. Yet here they depart from both: and arbitrarily introduce the word "GOD;" which is not only not to be found in either, but which is not even pretended to have place, in any one of the MSS. Versions or Fathers, known to be in existence. *Τον λαλουντα*, (simply *him that speaketh*; "*loquentem*," as the Vul-

gate has it; or, as old *Wiclif*, "*the speaker* ;") is the only reading of the passage. So that, here, there is a direct *fabrication* of the word "god," and a gross imposition upon the reader.

To say that the word has been introduced because the Unitarians conceive *God* to have been intended as *the speaker* ; is merely to say, that, whatever Unitarians choose to consider as the meaning, should be substituted for the language, and introduced into the text, of Scripture: in a word, that the comment of the lowest and most illiterate order of Socinians, shall be taken as forming a part of the original of the New Testament. This transcends Popery itself. The *Council of Trent* only decreed, that the comment, imposed by the *Church of Rome*, should be received, as giving the *meaning* of Scripture. But the *Council of Essex Street* ordains, that the Comment, imposed by the *Church which denies Christ*, shall be received as *part* of Scripture itself. —That the word is printed in Italics, is but a poor evasion. The common and uninformed reader, on whom alone these writers can hope to produce an effect; the *unlearned* man "of sound understanding," whom they select as the proper arbiter of *their* criticisms; but little attends to, and is for the most part ignorant of this distinction. And that these Unitarian Editors *designed*, by the introduction of this word into the text, something more than the mere declaration of *their opinion*, that it was *God* who was intended, is evident; because the whole of this purpose would have been completely answered by the statement of that opinion in the Note. Let it for a moment be supposed, that the Received Version, instead of reading, "him who speaketh," had substituted "*Christ in his divine nature*" for the word "him;" would the Unitarians conceive, that King James's translators had dealt

fairly with the public? Would they not, on the contrary, clamour loudly against this, as a dishonest attempt to impose the Trinitarian comments as the texts of Scripture? Would there be any end to the outcry, which on this ground would be raised against "*interested priests*;" against men *engaged* to defend an established system"—"the profession of which is *paid for* out of the public purse,"—and "who are from that very circumstance, *engaged to discourage enquiry and to oppose truth*:" and to whom, as we are told, "TRUTH MUST NECESSARILY BE THE OBJECT OF AVERSION AND ABHORRENCE." Yet this, which would be so heinous in a Trinitarian Clergy, is precisely what has been done by their Socinian opponents and calumniators; who have (vainly) endeavoured to exclude the idea of Christ, by the unwarrantable introduction of the word "*God*" into the text.

When they subjoin in a note, that it is "*evident that God is the speaker intended*;" it may fairly be asked, why then did they not trust the passage to this *evidence*. If the reader *must* have understood GOD, by "him that speaketh;" why not leave the text in its *true* state to announce its own *indubitable* meaning? Why *fabricate* a text, to sustain a truth, that must of itself *manifestly* shine forth? The reader will easily supply the answer. The fact is, they plainly saw, that the text, *as it stands*, must unavoidably lead the mind to CHRIST, as the *speaker*. They saw more: they saw, that it not only introduces CHRIST, as the speaker *now*; but as the speaker *before*, both in GIVING THE LAW, and in UTTERING ORACLES THROUGH THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD DISPENSATION. They saw in truth, that not only the *pre-existence*, but the *divinity* of CHRIST, was obviously deducible from this passage; and that thus, although GOD indeed was spoken of, it was in a sense directly

opposite to theirs, being GOD IN CHRIST: and therefore they very prudently, and with the *wisdom* belonging to *their generation*, have made the *requisite* alteration in the text.* Thus it is, that the Unitari-

* We see how this passage in Hebrews is disposed of.—Christ is not here specifically named. His being clearly pointed out in the context, signifies nothing. His being *so* clearly pointed out, that, if the passage were left to itself, every reader must at once discern the reference—produces on the Editors no other effect, than that of deciding them to guard against such reference, by introducing the word “*God*” into the sentence, and thereby overturning the force of the context. It is enough for *these* critics, to have it in their power to *say*, that Christ is not *actually named*: and *therefore* Christ cannot be meant: and *therefore* the word “*God*” may be introduced into the text. Well then, let us go now to another passage, in which Christ *is* expressly named: and where, as in the passage before us, he is described, as personally employed under the old dispensation, being specially designated as the Jehovah who was tempted by the Israelites in the wilderness. See 1 Cor. x. 9. “Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.” The Greek in all the received copies, and as it is admitted also by Griesbach, stands thus: Μὴδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθὼς καὶ τινες αὐτὸν ἐπειράσαν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ὀφείων ἀποθλοντο. Here, then, is CHRIST named, and clearly pointed out as existing under the Old Covenant. What is to be done now? Why, now that CHRIST *is* named, the word should be struck out; and *then* the text gives no support to the idea of our Lord’s pre-existence. Certainly; all this is clear. But why strike it out? Because there are *some* MSS. that read Κυριον, the Lord, and there are one or two, that read Θεον, God. Well, admit all this. What follows? Shall we take the report of Griesbach upon the evidence of the MSS. and Versions? That critic, to whom the Editors affect at all times to appeal; and for the close adherence to whose *corrected text*, they were principally induced (as they assure us,) to select Archbishop Newcome’s translation as the basis of their own: what effect do these variations of the MSS. produce upon *his* judgment? None whatever to lead him to disturb the usual reading of the text: which, on the fullest investigation, and after the interval even between the first and second editions of his work, allowing ample time for farther consideration, he has pronounced to be the true one. Erasmus, also, the great favourite of the Unitarians, acknowledges “Christ” as the genuine reading, without dispute.

rian, finding that Scripture, as it stands, will not sustain his system, imposes his own gloss for the language of the inspired writer, and substitutes his

Locke does the same. Rosenmuller does the same. Wolf, Mill, and Whitby do the same. The last of these indeed asserts, that the case is so clear, that "this reading ought not to be questioned." In truth there can be no reasonable doubt which way the evidence lies as to the true reading. And this is not disputed by the Editors themselves: not even by the *hot-test* of their disputants, the CALM Inquirer. They huddle up the matter hastily by naming a couple of MSS. that read *Κυριον*, and one that reads *Θεω*, and then at once shelter themselves under the arbitrary reading of the word *Lord* by Primate Newcome; who, undoubtedly, in this, as well as in the passage treated of above, and in some other parts of his translation of the N. T. has not acquitted himself in the manner most creditable to him, either as a critic, or as a Theologian.

I must not omit to mention here, as it helps on the estimate of his general accuracy in *matters of fact*, that Mr. Belsham, by way of strengthening the evidence for the reading of *Κυριον*, quotes "the Syriac Version" in support of that reading, whereas the Syriac, (that is, what every one who understands the subject calls by that name, the *ancient* Syriac, or *Peshito*,) reads *Χριστον*; and it is only a *later* Syriac that gives *Κυριον*; and this too, it must be observed, merely in the margin; yet Mr. Belsham unqualifiedly asserts as an authority for *Κυριον*, that THE SYRIAC VERSION reads it.—*Calm Inq.* pp. 157, 158. So much for *precision* and *truth*.

Well then, we have here a reading adopted by the Unitarians directly *against evidence*; for the express purpose of preventing the application of a passage to Christ, which *must establish his pre-existence*. It should be remembered too, that even were we to admit the reading which the Unitarians require, nothing would be gained by them, unless they could make it appear, that, by the word *Lord*, (his familiar appellation throughout the N. T.) Christ could not in this place have been intended. And even could they make this appear, they would then only have removed one text, from the multitude of those that support the doctrine. But, on the other hand, it is important for them to recollect, that, if the word "Christ" be (as the MSS. and Versions pronounce,) the true reading, then the Unitarian doctrine is at an end: for then our Lord's divinity is at once established. If Christ was the Being who was tempted by the Israelites in the Wilderness, then he unavoidably becomes the Jehovah of

system for Scripture. That just cause existed for the charge brought against the Unitarians, of *altering the scriptures to suit their own system*, seems

the Old Testament. If they turn to Erasmus, to whom they so frequently appeal, he will tell them so; for he pronounces, that, if the word *αυτον* belongs to the text, (a word which is not only given to it by some MSS. but which cannot in sense be separated from it, as we shall hereafter see,) then the divinity of Christ is placed beyond all question—"declaratur Christi divinitas, quem a Judæis tentatum dicit priusquam hominem assumeret." And, accordingly, from this text, Whitby asserts, that the divinity of Christ was from old times demonstratively confirmed. The Unitarians, then, stake their denial of the divinity of our Lord, upon the propriety of their rejection of the word "Christ" from this text, in opposition to the authorities by which alone genuine scripture can be ascertained: that is, they stake their very salvation, on the adoption of a reading, which is *against evidence*.

They would persuade themselves, indeed, that, even admitting "Christ" to be the true reading, they can still contrive a way to escape from the conclusion in favour of his divinity, by supposing the word *God* introduced into the sentence, after the clause, "as some of them also tempted."—"Nor let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted"—whom?—another being not yet spoken of—*God*:—"as some of them also tempted *God*." Here, again, we have the word *GOD* fabricated, in like manner as we have seen it above in the passage of Hebrews. No one MS. Version, or Father reads it, or supposes it. Indeed this is not pretended. It is admitted also, that the original is *against* it; inasmuch as the *same* person is, agreeably to all the ordinary principles of construction, to be understood, after the word "tempted," in the two corresponding clauses. And, accordingly, the Imp. Vers. renders the sentence, "Nor let us try the Lord, as some of them also tried *him*." To this conclusion we should naturally be brought, even though the word, *και*, ALSO, had no place in the sentence: but, *with this*, the meaning seems fixed beyond the reach of doubt. And, indeed, so long as the word *Κυριον* or *Θεον* is supposed to be the reading, the true principle of interpretation receives universal assent: but let *Χριστον* take their place, and it is at once abandoned: all the rules of grammar, and all the canons of construction are, by this single change, instantly put to flight. "If we read *Χριστον*, the sense is, nor let us tempt, &c. Christ now; as some of them did God at that time." Thus say the Editors, and ! Newcome. But let

plainly admitted by one of themselves, as we have seen at page 241 of this volume; where (with an ingenuousness not exactly characteristic of the

it be observed, that the word “also” has here been very *conveniently* forgotten. It would have sounded rather awkwardly, to speak of the Israelites of that day, having ALSO provoked God, as the Corinthians (addressed by the Apostle,) did *not* provoke him. Besides, it seems rather an odd way of keeping up the antithesis between the Corinthian converts and the early Israelites, which is so markedly carried on by the writer both before and after. The Corinthians are guarded against the *same* offences, (of idolatry, of fornication, and of rebellious murmuring,) of which their fathers had been guilty in the wilderness; and, in the midst of this enumeration, they are guarded against the tempting of a Being, *different* from that Being, which their fathers had tempted; and against an offence, of course, *different* from that of their fathers!

But, to explain, a little more fully, the principles of translation adopted by the Editors, let us see, how the matter exactly stands, according to their shewing. If the sentence be, *Μηδὲ ἐκπειράζετε τὸν Κύριον, καθὼς καὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἐπαράσαν;* then they say, the translation is, “Nor let us try the Lord, as some of them ALSO tried *him*.” Or, if *Θεὸν* be substituted for *Κύριον*, they admit it to be, “Neither let us try God, as some of them ALSO tried *him*.” But if *Χριστὸν* be substituted, then it is, “Nor let us try Christ, as some of them ALSO tried [*some other being*; for example] *God*.”—Wherefore GOD? As far as the original is concerned, any other being might as well be introduced: no one MS. or reading of the original, introduces this word after *ἐπαράσαν*: nor is *God* spoken of in the parts immediately preceding or following, so as to admit the possibility of implication from the context. Wherefore, then, the difference in the mode of translation? Wherefore any other, than the word “*him*,” supplied as before? Wherefore, the grammar and the construction, which are admitted, (and justly and unavoidably admitted,) where *Κύριον* or *Θεὸν* is the reading, immediately abandoned, when *Χριστὸν* comes in their place? The answer is plainly and simply this: and there can be no other:—that, unless this be done, the pre-existence and divinity of Christ must inevitably be conceded. Now, this being what Mr. Belsham and his brother Editors can never admit; it being for the very purpose of overturning such absurd and indefensible notions, that they have taken the trouble of engaging in the Version, which they have given to the public; of course, it follows, that no rules of construction,

Sect,) the writer confesses and regrets, that they have followed "*no standard text*" whatever; that is, in other words, that they have modified the text

no principles of language can be allowed, that will justify such a result: and thus, this text, like others, is removed from the support of such incomprehensible doctrines.

So the process goes on, till the Unitarian is enabled to look round with triumph, and behold all subjected to his system. Having thus freely applied his theology to model both the text and the sense of Scripture; it is strange, if the text and the sense of Scripture do not yield support to his theology. He may, surely, with much safety declare, that he can "find no evidence whatever to prove" the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence, after he has himself defaced and purloined that evidence wherever it existed. He may now travel from *Dan* to *Beersheba*, and cry that all is barren, after he has made it so.—For the views of a scholar, a grammarian and a critic, upon this verse, and upon the grammatical necessity that exists of supplying the word *αυτον*, *him*, I refer the reader to the joint authority of Glassius and Dathe, *Philol. Sacr.* i. pp. 172, 173.

I must add yet a few remarks more, on the Unitarian management of the reading of the text in question. It has been seen, that they reject the word *Χριστον*, *against the evidence* of the MSS. and Versions and Fathers: and again, that, apprehensive, that the weight of evidence will overbear that rejection, and that *Χριστον* will still be received as the true reading, they *on this supposition*, reject *και* against the preponderance of MSS. and they add *Θεον* at the end of the second clause, without even pretending any authority for doing so; but, solely, of their own arbitrary will and pleasure. But yet more, they do this, in defiance of certain MSS. which actually connect the word *αυτου* or *αυτου* with *πειρασαν*, and thereby make the word *HIM* a part of the text, to the necessary exclusion of the word, which the Editors would introduce. Now, although the authority for the reading of the word *HIM* as part of the text, is actually stronger than that, which appears in support of the word *Θεον* in the first clause, (a reading, adopted by some, and spoken of with respect by the Editors,) yet, as its being part of the text could not make it one iota more certain, than it already appears from the construction, that it must be the same person, who is said to have been tempted in the second clause, that the Corinthians are warned not to tempt, in the first, I lay no stress whatever upon this circumstance: I merely mention it, to show the complication of defiance to *all* authorities, into which the determi-

of the N. T. just as they found it answerable to their purpose. It is not, however, wonderful, that they have done so. They have been driven to it by the

nation to exclude the divinity of Christ at every hazard, leads these Unitarian critics.

An assertion of Mr. Belsham, in the endeavour to support the reading of *Κυριον* instead of *Χριστον*, should not be passed over. He says without qualification, "Irenæus CERTAINLY read *Κυριον*, Lord." *Calm Inq.* p. 157. Now, in this, Mr. Belsham is peremptorily opposed, not only by Mill and Whitby, but also by Griesbach. This, it is to be observed, is the *third* point, on which he has been at variance with Griesbach, on the single reading of *Κυριον*: 1st, as to the resulting support of this reading by the MSS. and Versions generally: 2dly, as to its being the reading of the Syriac Version: and 3dly, as to its being the reading of Irenæus. In all these points, the *Calm Inquirer* is not only egregiously wrong, but at direct variance with Griesbach. Now, with respect to Griesbach, it is full time to ask, whether this *great Editor*, the correctness of whose estimate of the readings of the Greek Testament, has, for many years, been the subject of over-flowing panegyric, and unqualified admiration, with Unitarians; and the appearance of whose volumes was judged by them, to have formed such an era in Biblical criticism, as to render it the fit time to produce a Version of the N. T. which might justly be called the "*Improved Version*:"—whether, I say, this *great Editor* is, after all, not to be relied upon, in his report of the readings of the MSS. and Versions and Fathers; and this, also, in a text so important, as to be in itself decisive of our Lord's Divinity?—It is not, however, an easy matter to satisfy Unitarians in the readings of Scripture. It is rather difficult to hit their taste in this respect. And, in truth, now that they have completed an *Improved Version* to their own satisfaction; the only thing wanted is, that they should supply a *Greek text*, which shall correspond with their Version. What they have done, is sufficient for the man of "sound understanding," whose knowledge does not extend beyond the language of the translation: what remains to be done, is requisite for those, who, to an acquaintance with the Greek, may, in judging of the translation, associate the strange fancy to know what is contained in the original. That original, it is manifest, (I mean an original for *their* translation,) is not supplied by Griesbach. And indeed it is quite time for them to give him up.

But, it is not merely with Griesbach, that the Unitarians are

necessity of the case. For, not only was there to be found *no* existing translation, which does not directly war with their system; but there was *no*

getting out of humour. Even their fast friend Marcion, they have fallen foul of, on this, and some other texts. Mr. Belsham reports, from Epiphanius, that Marcion introduced the false reading of *Christ*, into this text, in place of *Κυριον*, *Lord*. And this same Marcion, both he and the I. V. likewise charge, (on the authority of Tertullian,) with having introduced the false reading of *Κυριον* into the text of 1 Cor. xv. 47; which text will be treated of in the ensuing note. (See *Calm Inq.* pp. 158, 120. and I. V. p. 403.) It would seem, as if this purloining heretic was influenced by a spirit of retribution: the word, which he is said to have stolen from one part of the Epistle, being replaced by him in another. But, with respect to this Marcion, it must be remembered, that this is the very same Marcion, on whose authority, the *Calm Inquirer* and his brother Editors have peremptorily rejected the first two chapters of St. Luke, in opposition to all the MSS. the Versions, and the Fathers: the same Marcion, whom the Editors see no reason not to consider, "as a man of learning and INTEGRITY:" (I. V. p. 120.) the same Marcion, of whom Mr. Belsham professes himself disposed to think very favourably, more especially as being a brother heretic; and in the behalf of whom, he expresses the strongest provocation against Tertullian and Epiphanius, for the charges they have brought against him, of corrupting the Scriptures; alleging, that these Fathers, in this and the other charges which they have advanced, to vilify the character of Marcion, have but indulged the true spirit of orthodoxy; which he characterizes, as a spirit of calumny and malignity, the same in all ages of the world. (*Lett. on Arian.* p. 72. and *Answer to the Brief Mem.* pp. 115, 116.) Yet, this very Marcion, whose *integrity* as a witness of the uncorrupted Gospel of St. Luke, is thus rescued from the calumnies of those Orthodox libellers, Tertullian and Epiphanius, is here charged with adulterating the Epistle of St. Paul, in the two passages referred to: and this, upon the authority of those very libellers, to whom, we have been told, we ought to yield no credit. Such is the honest consistency of these worthy Unitarians, (to whom "TRUTH" is supposed *not* to be "THE OBJECT OF AVERSION AND ABHORRENCE,") on every point, on which it seems practicable to filch away some portion of the evidence for the divinity of Christ.

Were we now to ask these *new libellers* of Marcion, in what manner, his corruptions of these passages could have passed

Greek text, to be discovered, from which, by any thing that could (even by them) be called a translation, they could derive it. They have been, there-

into the copies of the orthodox; who must, as we are informed, have viewed him with such malignity; and by whom, we know, that both he and his followers were strenuously opposed, and his copies of the N. T. attacked as spurious (Mill. Proleg. p. 36.)—they would not find it very easy to give an answer.

It is remarkable, that Mr. Lindsey has made a long quotation from Mill, for the purpose of supporting, by *his* authority, the supposition, that Marcion's corruption of one of these texts, 1 Cor. xv. 47. had crept into the Greek copies of this Epistle: at the same time, that Mill has expressly retracted his error, as to that supposition; and has argued, as above referred to, in defence of its direct contradiction: and yet more, that even in the very note, from which Mr. Lindsey has taken his quotation, and in a part immediately following it, this change of opinion is declared, and the desire that it should be particularly noticed distinctly set forth,—“indicta esse jubet,”—and the very place also pointed out, in which the reasons for the change are assigned. Yet Mr. Lindsey has abided by the disowned opinion: has omitted all notice of the retraction: and has left upon record, as the true and deliberate opinion of Mill, that which Mill has declared and proved to be erroneous. See Lindsey's Sequel, p. 267. and Mill. p. 398. Proleg. pp. 36. 140. What are the peculiar qualities of the Socinian apostacy, that can work such effects upon the mind of such a man, as, we are told, Mr. Lindsey was!

Again, to drop all further consideration of this absurd notion of Marcion's corruptions having passed into our present copies, and spread through the Versions and Fathers, let us examine, in what way, the word $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, (in the passage with which we are immediately concerned,) could have slid into the place of $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, or $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, in the ancient MSS. What error of transcribing can we imagine to have produced such an effect. Here, indeed, we have an instance, of the length, to which, certain Commentators, who are in the habit of taking liberties with the sacred text, will be carried in the support of an hypothesis. On the authority of a *single* manuscript, (on the reading of which MS. also there is thrown a suspicion by Wetstein which is not rejected by Griesbach,) Grotius, and, after him, Wakefield (adding *his* mite of a *single* Version, and that the *Ethiopic*, which the Unitarians themselves have condemned him for rating too highly,) have adopted the reading of $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ for $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$: and have

fore, compelled, not only to *invent* (I must term it,) a new translation for the text; but also to *invent* a new text for the translation. Their plan, in a word,

done so, on the supposition, that in the abbreviated mode of writing, the one word was mistaken by the transcriber for the other; $\overline{XN}$ for $\overline{\Theta N}$. Now, it is singular enough, that, when the accidental transition from $\overline{\Theta C}$ to $\overline{OC}$ has been contended for, as an admissible supposition, in the text in 1 Tim. iii. 16. where also numerous MSS. and other authorities actually exhibit the former of the two words, at this very day; and where (as far as the MSS. are concerned,) the mere wearing out of the two straight lines would, (independently of the errors of transcribing,) effect the change, of which indeed we seem to have satisfactory evidence from the fact itself as to the *Alexandrian*:—this supposition is, at once, rejected by a certain class of critics; whilst, in the case before us, where the form of x is to pass into that of Θ , the transition is considered as not unlikely. The cases, however, it must be admitted, differ in one material respect. The one supposition is in favour of the orthodox doctrine: and the other *not*. And whatever favours the Orthodox, deserves no quarter. I speak not here, merely in reference to the insane and vulgar rant, in which such writers as the *Calm Inquirer* never fail to indulge, against whatever bears the name of Orthodox, (see pp. 673. 683, &c.) but I allude even to one of the grave and deliberate canons of criticism laid down by Griesbach, in his *Prolegomena*, (p. lxvi.) where he pronounces, that, “amongst different readings of the text, that one is to be suspected, which most favours the opinions of the Orthodox.” From which, at least, it is reasonable to infer, that whatever readings, in favour of the Orthodox opinion, may have had *his* sanction, have not been preferred by him from any bias in behalf of Orthodoxy. This is a very material observation; and serves at the same time to assign a cause for the extravagance of Unitarian panegyric, which has been bestowed upon this writer; and to confer a value of no small amount upon his concessions to Orthodoxy.

To return to the subject of the change pretended to be made in the reading of the text before us—I recommend to the reader the following observations of Mill’s—“Quasi vero proclive fuerit librariis x scribere pro Θ : aut lectionem qualis illa Κυριος aut Θεος commodam, mutare in durio rem hanc, et ad quam im-
pegerint lectores, Χριστον . Certe, cum Editis congruant non solum IRENEUS,” (*certainly not*, says Mr. Belsham,) “Theodotus in πιστομαις , ac Scriptores Gr. Lat. complures; sed et Exempla-

has been, first to shape the scripture according to their theory: and then to establish their theory, by the scripture. In truth, it is scarcely possible for any

ria MSS. universim, et quidem Clar. Gr. Lat. Ger. Gr. Lat. quique Marcionis tempora præcessisse videtur Interpres Vulgatus; *omni-
no crediderim* ab Apostolo ipso scriptum $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$: *mutatum autem hoc*
in $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, *ab audaculo quodam studioso, cui minus verum, si placet, quod*
ex recepta lectione dicitur, Israelitas tentasse CHRISTUM in deserto."
This last clause very truly expresses the state of the case.—
The more than "audaculi studiosi," with whom we are con-
cerned, not being able to reconcile themselves to the idea, that
Christ had been actually tempted by the Israelites in the wil-
derness, have therefore presumed, that "*Christ*" cannot have
been the word used by the Apostle: and, on the strength of
this presumption, insist on substituting for it, even against evi-
dence, $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ or $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$. For the former of these two words, very
few, indeed, have ventured to contend: and, by the latter,
which the Editors would force upon us, not much, (as has been al-
ready observed,) is gained to their cause, unless they can make
it appear, that, by "*the Lord*," CHRIST is not here intended.—
On the application of this title $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$, *the Lord*, to CHRIST, by the
writers of the N. T.; I would particularly recommend to the
reader, the admirable remarks of Pearson, in his Exposition, p.
145—150. I would request of him, also, to observe the great
number of instances, in which, not only throughout the N. T.
at large, but specially in this very chapter of 1 Corinthians,
CHRIST is *emphatically* designated by this title. It is of impor-
tance likewise, (and particularly on the present occasion,) to
recollect, that this title of $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$, by which Jesus Christ is so
constantly named in the New Testament, is the Greek word
employed by the Jews as equivalent to *Jehovah* in the Old: and
that, by this very name of "*Jehovah*," it is declared by the
prophet Jeremiah, (xxiii. 6.) *Christ* was to be called; as indeed
we find it admitted by the Jewish writers themselves, who de-
rive, from *this* text, the proof, that *JEHOVAH* was to be the true
name of the *Messiah*. I allude to this passage of Jeremiah the
more willingly, because it gives me an opportunity of stating,
that the attempts, which have been recently made by Dr. Car-
penter and Mr. Belsham, to escape from the force and appli-
cation of the Prophet's language, have been counteracted
and chastised so completely, by the successive publications of
Dr. Nares and the Bishop of St. David's, that scarcely any
thing farther can be desired upon this subject. See Dr. Nares?

person who has not submitted to the odious labour of examining for himself (an odious labour *I* can truly aver it to be,) to form an adequate idea, of the

Remarks, &c. p. 46—51. 2d Ed. and The Bible, &c. p. 96—103. The latter, in particular, seems almost to exhaust the subject.

I am here, however, obliged to protest against the position of a learned Professor, in one of the English Universities, who has lately affirmed, in his Lectures, that “in the Septuagint the word Jehovah is *never* expressed by *Θεός*, but *uniformly* by *Κυριος*.” That this position is directly contradicted by the fact, is so notorious, that it is quite inconceivable, how the learned Professor could have been led to make it: nor indeed should I have thought it necessary to observe upon this mistake, if it were not connected with an argument, whose bearing is too important to suffer it to pass unnoticed. The word Jehovah, the Professor says, being considered by the Jews as a word too sacred for human utterance; whenever they met with this word in the Bible, they read for it another word expressive not of *God*, but of *Lord*: and hence he accounts for the peculiarity of the Septuagint translation alleged in his position. And thus, in truth, whilst the Professor has stated in words, that “*JEHOVAH*” is *always* expressed in the Septuagint by *Κυριος*, he evinces by his argument, that he means to say, that the word “*JEHOVAH*” is *never* so expressed; since it is not “*JEHOVAH*,” but another word, implying *Lord*, (by which he must mean יהוה,) that was rendered by the word *Κυριος* in the LXX. But the argument of the learned Professor, I cannot avoid saying, has as little foundation in reason, as the result which he derives from it, has in fact. To give the argument any force, the Seventy-two must be supposed to have translated, not from a written copy of the Hebrew Scriptures, but from hearing them read: or it must be contended, that not only the *Tetragrammaton* itself was deemed a word too sacred for human utterance, but that its translation into any other language was deemed, not merely too sacred to be uttered, but even to be written; a degree of sacredness not attached even to the original word itself. Neither of these suppositions can be maintained. The argument used by the Professor, had been formerly advanced by Crellius, against the Divinity of Christ, and has been most triumphantly confuted by Pearson, who has clearly shewn, that the hypothesis, which lies at the foundation of the whole, is a mere vulgar error. It is indeed, a matter of regret, that the authority of the Professor’s name, should afford any colour for the revival of this Socinian cavil. But whilst, in truth, no name can sustain it, it is for-

mode, in which the sacred word has been abused and falsified, throughout the version (or it should rather be entitled *perversion*,) of the New Testa-

ment, that the principle of its immediate refutation is found, in the very position laid down by the Professor himself. For, had the LXX been really governed by the rule which has been prescribed to them, the word JEHOVAH would have been (as the Professor has alleged it to be,) *uniformly* expressed by *Kypios*, and *never* by *Θεος*. But, as the fact is otherwise, and JEHOVAH is *not* uniformly expressed by *Kypios*, but sometimes by *Θεος*; it follows, that the LXX were not governed by this rule.

It is indeed true, that *Kypios* is the word, by which JEHOVAH is *generally* rendered, in the Septuagint; *so* generally, that it is not wonderful, that from want of proper attention, its universality should be actually inferred. And, from this results the fair and natural conclusion, which we have already contended for, that the Jews, when using the Greek language, would consider the word *Kypios*, as equivalent to JEHOVAH. And, indeed, whoever wishes to see, how peculiarly this word was, in its primary sense, adapted, to convey the force of the Hebrew term, will receive the fullest satisfaction, from Pearson's observations, at p. 147. of his Exposition. How differently from that profound thinker and learned writer, do the light and airy critics of the Imp. Vers. treat this word, which was so habitually employed, in Jewish acceptance, as the name of the great Jehovah! In their modern and janty phrase, it is, in many cases, disguised under the unmeaning appellation of *Sir*, or *Master*; and might nearly as well, as far as the conveyance of its true and original import is concerned, have been translated *Esquire*. For the true value of this word as applied to Christ by the Fathers, the reader may consult Suicer. Thes. Eccl. ii. 193. &c.

We have seen, in this note, no small variety in the exercises of Unitarian ingenuity, for the convenient modification of the text in question. First, the word 'CHRIST' must be rejected from the text, and the word 'LORD' substituted in its place. Secondly, if 'CHRIST' must be retained, then, to do away the effect of this, the word 'ALSO' must be struck out, and the word 'God' must be supplied, from the translator's own sovereign pleasure. And lastly, to guard against such an application of the title LORD, either here or elsewhere, as might intimate the divinity of Christ, they are careful, every where, to break the connexion between this word and the sacred name of JEHOVAH, and to reduce it, on all occasions, to the insignificance of the most ordinary appellative. But a contrivance, not less extrava-

ment by the Unitarians. Examples abound, of a nature similar to that, which has been just adduced: and many, of a quality yet more insidious and dishonest.

gant than any of these, remains to be noticed. It is the invention of a Mr. Simpson, communicated in a work, which he has entitled "Essays on the Language of Scripture;" and which, from the specimen produced, I rejoice that I have never seen. The contrivance is neither more nor less than this: to turn '*Christ*' into *Moses*, and, at the same time, to let the word stand *also* for the Messiah. "'Nor let us try the Anointed' i. e. the Messiah (Acts x. 38.) 'as some of them also tried the Anointed,' i. e. *Moses*." The word '*Christ*,' then, we see, denotes both *Jesus* and *Moses*: and, consequently, the whole difficulty, arising from the supposition, that it was the same Christ who had been tempted by the Israelites, that might now be tempted by the Corinthians, is entirely done away. After this, what is there, that words may not mean, in the vocabulary of a Unitarian Commentator? This, too, it must be noticed, is mentioned with much approbation, by Dr. Carpenter, who quotes it, and other matter equally precious, from the same writer, at p. 229. of *Unit. the Doct. &c.* And, as this publication of Dr. Carpenter's is, (I apprehend) the latest of the Unitarian productions, that treat of this part of Scripture, we have therefore reason to consider this, as their latest and most recognised exposition of the text. However, the very extravagance of this their last approved interpretation, carries with it the concession of the two points contended for in this note: namely, that '*Christ*' is the true reading of the text, and that the same word '*Christ*' is to be applied to the verb '*tempted*' in the two corresponding clauses. As to this one word denoting in these clauses, two different persons, that is the concern of those who defend this solution. The more untenable it is, the more manifest the cogency of the admissions that have compelled it.

To sum up the whole, I shall now subjoin the Greek text, as it stands with the *unanimous* consent of the printed copies, (Griesbach of course included;) and the several translations of the passage, as they are given in the received Version and by the Unitarians.

Μηδὲ πειρασάμεν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθὼς καὶ τινες αὐτὸν πειράσαν.

Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted.
Rec. Vers.

Nor let us try the Lord, as some of them also tried him.
Imp. Vers.

But, the point, with which we are at present more immediately concerned, is not so much the departure from the Primate, or Griesbach, or from the MSS. Versions and Fathers, nor yet the imposition of a false text, as the departure from the

Nor let us try Christ now, as some of them tried God at that time. Imp. Vers. note.

Nor let us try the Anointed, (the Messiah,) as some of them also tried the Anointed, (Moses.) Mr. Simpson as quoted by Dr. Carpenter.

By which of these Versions the reader is *honestly* treated, with regard to the original, he may judge for himself.—For the most valuable remarks, both on the reading and true interpretation of this important text, I refer the reader to Cameron, whom, I have often found strong reasons to recommend, as a judicious Commentator. (See Crit. Sac. vii. pp. 2992, 2993.) Wolf also deserves to be consulted. Cur. Phil. in locum. Diedati's translation is, as usual, correct: and, on the word '*Christ*,' supplies this pointed marginal illustration, "Ilquale è quell' ANGELO, che andava col popolo; chiamato così per lo suo ufficio; e SIGNORE IDDIO, per la sua natura." Doddridge, also, is well deserving of notice. He adds to a good explanation of the original, "this is a considerable *text* in proof of Christ's residence with the Church in the Wilderness, as the *angel* of God's presence."—On the "*rock that followed*" the Israelites, being called "*Christ*," in a verse preceding this one and treating on the same general subject, it may be worth while to remark, that Grotius uses the following words. "Deus ^{rox} in Veteri Test. Christus in Novo." This, with good reason. The same rock, which *Jehovah* is called in the O. T. our Lord Jesus Christ is justly called in the New. But, the remark, it is to be remembered, is Grotius's. I mention this for the satisfaction of *Unitarians*.—Indeed, considering that they wish much to represent him as a fellow labourer, they are obliged very often to quarrel with him. When, in following on the resemblance between the rock in the Wilderness, and Christ, he is led to make the following observations; "*Christus ad mortem percussus spiritum suis obtinuit*;" and "*Christus per spiritum nobiscum est ad finem sæculi*:" he is pretty smartly rebuked by Mr. Lindsey, who professes himself dissatisfied with his too refined and unwarranted allusions. (Sequel, &c. p. 260.) But it was more than the *refinement* of the allusion, that here displeased Mr. Lindsey.

PRIMATE WITHOUT ACKNOWLEDGMENT. It must, indeed, be admitted, that, with respect to the clause hitherto considered, the Editors are not chargeable on this head: for, in their note, they confess, that, both in the Greek and Newcome, the reading is, "See that ye refuse not him who speaketh." But they take care to acknowledge nothing more. They give not the slightest intimation, of their studied variations from the Primate, in the succeeding clauses of the verse, devised for the purpose of adjusting its several parts to that application of the passage, which their hypothesis requires, and which is precisely contradictory to that of Newcome. How laboriously and carefully this is done, may be seen on looking to the two contrasted renderings at page 244 of this volume. It should also be particularly observed, that, in their note, the Editors enter into an argument, for the purpose of shewing, that Christ is not the object of reference in this passage; and yet, never once let fall the most remote hint, that the Primate has translated it, so as to lead to a directly opposite conclusion; much less, that he has drawn out that conclusion in a note, whose sole purpose is to mark to the reader's attention, that our Lord is here alluded to by the writer, as "*the Angel of the Covenant*, who presided at giving the Law." The notice, which they have taken of the Primate's rendering of the *first clause*, does not, (it should be remembered) necessarily convey any idea, of a difference between him and them, on the main subject and true sense of the entire passage: since, under the words, "him who speaketh," the Primate might possibly have understood GOD, although he might not think it right to introduce it into the text. And, as the Editors inform us, that, by these words, GOD must evidently have been intended; and, at the same time, ac-

knowledge no other difference than the mere use of these words in the Primate's translation; they have, in truth, given the reader to understand, that there *is* no other; although, both in the text and notes, he and they are diametrically opposed: his version of this passage involving in it a direct declaration of the PRE-EXISTENCE of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his HEAVENLY ORIGIN;* whilst theirs

* I had conceived, that, in Number III, (p. 287—304.) I had noticed the principal evasions and glosses, by which, the Unitarians have struggled, (although with little effect,) to escape from the admission of our Lord's *heavenly* origin and pre-existence. These, however, it is not easy to exhaust. Another, and of very important bearing, is to be found, in their treatment of the passage in 1 Cor. xv. 47. The Greek of this text runs thus, Ο πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός· ὁ δευτέρος ἀνθρώπος ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. But from the variations of MSS. Griesbach is induced to think it *probable*, that the word κύριος is not genuine, and that οὐρανοῦ should be followed by οὐρανίος. The Received Version, abiding by the Greek, renders the passage, "The first man *is* of the earth, earthy: the second man *is* the Lord from heaven." The Vulgate reads "Primus homo de terra, terrenus: secundus homo de cælo, cœlestis:"—to which the old Version of Wiclif adheres, "The firste man of erthe is ertheli, the secunde man of hevene is hevenli." Whether we abide by the Greek or the Latin reading of this text, is of little consequence, as to the main point, in which they perfectly agree: namely, that the words, ἐκ γῆς, express the origin of the *first Adam*; and the words, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, express the origin of the *second Adam*; that is, as the Bishop of St. David's justly distinguishes, "not the origin of his mortal frame, but the origin of HIM who assumed that mortal frame." Whether the word κύριος be expressed or not, is a matter of little moment, (and its application indeed must follow as a consequence,) if it be admitted, that the second Adam came from heaven, when he first appeared upon this earth. The Unitarians, accordingly, to avoid a confession so completely ruinous to their cause, render the passage thus, "The first man *was* from the ground, earthy: the second man *will be* from heaven [heavenly.]" Now, here, we have a change of tense, which not only has no foundation in either the Greek or the Latin text, but is in direct opposition to both; since, in both, the perfect sameness of the corresponding clauses obviously determines the sameness of the tense. The

excludes, not only, his *pre-existence* and *heavenly descent*, but himself altogether, from the import of the original. In the treatment, then, of this pas-

total inadmissibility of this *arbitrary* rendering of the Unitarians, and the grossness of their endeavour to pervert the sense of scripture in this important passage, have been already so triumphantly exposed by the Bishop of St. David's, that it is unnecessary for me, to add any thing farther upon these subjects. I shall therefore, confine myself, simply, to the mode, in which it has been attempted to sustain the Unitarian version of the passage by Mr. Belsham; whose special office it is, (as we have already had frequent occasion to observe,) to vamp the flimsy criticisms of the Imp. Vers. with the equally flimsy material of the *Calm Inquiry*.

The grand point to be established for the Unitarians, is, as we have seen, the use of the *future*, in the second clause of the text:—"the second man WILL BE from heaven:"—for, if we read "WAS from heaven," *actum est*, it is all over with the Unitarians; inasmuch as, in this passage, the origin of the BEING, without any possible pretence as to the *doctrines*, is unequivocally the subject. How does Mr. Belsham proceed? Having made a good deal of flourish, as the I. V. had also done before him, about the words *κυριος* and *ουρανιος*; having also lumped together some irrelevant matter about the Polish Socinians and Dr. Price: and observed somewhat upon the interpretation of Newcome, Whitby, and Alexander: having, in short, appeared to say a good deal, whilst he took care to preserve a profound silence throughout, (as the I. V. also has done,) respecting any arguments in favour of the *future tense* in the second clause,—the single point on which the entire question rests:—he, all of a sudden, very calmly and composedly asserts, "The Vulgate renders the text, 'The first man was of the earth, earthy. The second man will be from heaven, heavenly.'" (*Calm Inq.* p. 121.) He then triumphantly concludes: and all is settled. In this manner, one text after another, of those that proclaim our Lord's pre-existence, is extinguished by the *Calm Inquirer* and his Coadjutors. And so the cause of Socinian expurgation goes forward.

Perhaps, in the annals of dishonest controversy, another instance like this is not to be found. A discussion of unimportant matter is *busily* kept up: the main point of difference, and in truth the only one deserving of attention, the *change of tense*, is passed over, as if it were a thing not at all in dispute: the Vulgate is then quoted, *in direct opposition to the truth*, as read-

sage of Hebrews, we find, at the same time, a direct fabrication of Scripture, and a gross and deliberate imposition upon the reader, as to the Pri-

ing the words "WAS," and "WILL BE," in the two corresponding clauses : and thus, indirectly, the false rendering of the text by the Unitarians, is sustained by a false quotation from the Vulgate ; and by a quotation, which, the author, if his memory lasted from one page to the other, must have known to be false ; since, in the preceding page, he had himself cited the very words of the Vulgate :—" *Primus homo de terra, terrenus : secundus homo de cœlo, cœlestis* :"—in which words, there is not only no justification of the change from WAS to WILL BE ; but there is, on the contrary, as in the original Greek, a declaration, as strong as the analogies of language will admit, that the tense employed in the first clause, must pass unchanged into the second. In a word ; there is given, by the Vulgate itself, a direct contradiction to the report, which is made of it by the *Calm Inquirer*. The man of "sound understanding," however, whom he addressed in *English* on the one page, being possibly not exactly acquainted with what was contained in the *Latin* on the other, and being consequently unaware, that his author was imposing on him a false translation, would of course be fully satisfied, on the authority of the Vulgate, (more especially, as so much had been said, to leave the general impression of uncertainty as to the true reading of the *Greek* text, and the consequent opinion, that the Vulgate was the only ancient authority to be relied on,) that in this passage could be found no proof of our Lord's pre-existence ! What must be the cause, that needs such support : and what the interests, that can attract such supporters !

As to the passage itself, having been led to notice it, I cannot forbear recommending to the reader, the admirable discussion which it receives from the Bishop of St. David's, p. 87—92. of *The Bible*, &c. The manner, in which this learned Prelate has treated the important subject to which it relates, is such, that I do not fear to pronounce, that any candid reader, who will carefully examine what he has advanced, will find in it a complete and irrefragable argument for the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, even had Scripture not spoken elsewhere, so unequivocally and repeatedly, upon the subject. To the valuable remarks, which are there to be found, I shall add but a few observations. On the 45th verse of the chapter with which we are concerned,—a verse, which, the bishop justly observes, is "a trying passage for a Unitarian," and on which, accordingly, the Editors of the *I. V.* and their brother commentators all cau-

mate's translation. This too, it should be recollected, as in the other instances which we have adduced, on a subject of vital bearing on the Unitarian scheme.

tiously abstain from making any remark,—we find the following distinction laid down by Cyril, in speaking on the difference between the first and second Adam, as to the nature of that *life*, which, in this verse, is specified to belong respectively to each. Grotius thus translates the words of that Father. “In Adam fuit *ἐπιτηδεωτικὴ* quædam ad vivendum, in Christo *ἐνεργητικὰ*.” This admirably marks that inherent power of giving life, that *πνεῦμα ζωοποιον τὸ τῆς Θεοτετιος λόγου* of the writer against the doctrine of Apollinarius, which is also quoted by Grotius on Mark ii. 8; and which, in his note on 1 Cor. xv. 45. he describes to be, (although he improperly traces its origin,) “*potestas etiam aliis dandi vitam, et quidem æternam*.”—Excellent distinctions, on the subject of these verses, are given by several of the Fathers, as quoted by Suicer. (Thes. Eccl. i. 80, 81, 353.) The observations of that judicious commentator Cameron, both on verses 45 and 47, deserve to be quoted. On verse 45 he says, “*Opponit Apostolus spiritum animæ, deinde viventi vivificantem: hoc enim majus est illo: nam qui dicit viventem, denotat actum immanentem in aliquo; qui vero dicit vivificantem, non modo actum in aliquo immanentem denotat, sed etiam emanantem et promanantem, quique in alio recipitur*.” And on the words, *ὁ Κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, in verse 47, he says: “*Sic notat Apostolus haud dubie originem Christi hominis, qui e cælo dicitur esse, non quod homo e cælo ad nos descenderit, sed quod Spiritus Sancti vi humana natura coagmentata fuit et coaptata Divinæ naturæ. Sic cum quæsit Christus a Phariseis, numquid Baptisma Johannis esset a cælo, non hoc voluit, num Johannis, baptisma esset a cælo deapsum, sed, an autorem habuerit cœlestem*.” Dr. Doddridge also deserves to be consulted on these two verses: and Dr. Nares's remarks on the latter of them, in refutation of Dr. Carpenter, are particularly worthy of observation.

I cannot forbear, also, for the satisfaction of Unitarians, who are so desirous of claiming Mr. Locke as a favourer of their doctrines, giving that writer's view of the passage in question. His paraphrase of the 47th, 48th, and 49th verses, is as follows. “The first man was of the earth, made up of dust, or earthy particles: *the second man is the Lord from heaven*. Some, who have no higher an extraction, than barely from the earthy man, they, like him, have barely an animal life and constitution: but those, who are regenerate, and born of the heavenly seed, are, as he that is heavenly, spiritual and immortal. And, as in the

The Unitarians, as they are bound to do by their system, strenuously contend, "that there is no evidence whatever to prove, that Christ was person-

animal, corruptible, moral state, we were born in, we have been like him, that was earthy; so also shall we, who, at the resurrection, partake of a spiritual life from Christ, be made like him, the Lord from heaven, heavenly, i. e. live as the *spirits in heaven do*, without the need of food, or nourishment, to support it, and without infirmities, decay and death, enjoying a fixed, stable, unfleeting life."—Here is the succour, which Mr. Locke gives to those, who pronounce Jesus Christ to have been a mere man: who deny, that he can be said, in the obvious sense of the words, to have come from Heaven: who, in truth, deny that there is any such place as Heaven: who ridicule the notion of separate spirits; and still more the idea of their having a local or heavenly residence.

I must yet go farther, and quote from one writer more, even from Mr. Wakefield himself. He thus renders the 47th and 48th verses. "The first, a man from the ground, *was* dust: the second, a man from heaven, *was* heavenly. They that *are* earthy, *are* like the *Adam* of the ground; and they that *are* heavenly, like him from heaven." I the more willingly refer to this writer, because it affords me the opportunity of noticing an additional act of disingenuousness, in the editors of the I. V. who, in their note on the 47th verse, have adduced this author's name in such a manner, as to impress the reader with the belief, that their novel version has the support of his authority, whilst his translation is *directly the opposite* of theirs: he reading "*was*" in both clauses of the verse, and admitting the heavenly origin of Christ; whilst the whole force, or rather trick, of their version, consists in an endeavour to exclude the notion of that *heavenly* origin, by the arbitrary introduction of the future "*will be*." Thus, as we have before seen the Vulgate turned to dishonest account, in that supplement to the Version entitled the Calm Inquiry; we here find Mr. Wakefield turned to the same account, in the Version itself. And hence, it is manifest that even Wakefield will not answer the purposes of the *modern* Socinians.

Were it indeed worth the trouble, abundance of reason might be produced, from a comparison of the two versions, why the Editors of the Imp. Version did not adopt Wakefield's as the basis of theirs. Some hobbling reasons, that cannot well be understood, are assigned by them for this determination, in the first page of their Introduction. But there was a *prudence* in it,

ally concerned in any of the former dispensations of God to mankind, either to the patriarchs or to the Jews, but that the contrary is explicitly and repeat-

of which they seem not disposed to boast. Departures from a *Bishop* of the *Established Church* were, of course, to be expected. But if they appeared *very frequently* to desert WAKEFIELD, as not pushing his version far enough for *their* objects, it might furnish too open a disclosure of what those objects were: and thereby defeat the system of *proselytism*, in which they have of late years so strenuously engaged; since, all, who possessed *any* moderation of judgment, must naturally be put upon their guard against translators of the New Testament, who were obliged to abandon *even* WAKEFIELD, as not heterodox enough. On Mr. Wakefield's translation of the 47th verse, I have one observation more to make; viz. that he professes, in this, exactly to follow the *Vulgate*. I leave his translation, then, to stare at Mr. Belsham's which has been given at page 697.

Having hitherto been employed in this note, in adducing authorities *against* the Unitarian version of 1 Cor. xv. 47, I should not deal fairly, if I did not also bring forward one or two authorities, which I have happened to light upon, *in its behalf*. The well known P. Harduin, in his Commentary upon this place, is of opinion, that the ο ισχυρος Αδამ of the 45th verse, means *any man* indifferently, but such as he will be after his resurrection.—Jehnio goes yet farther. He is of opinion, that even the phrase, Κυριος εξ ουρανου, is designed to be applied to *every man*, after his resurrection (in which state he denominates him *δευτερος*;) because he then triumphs over death, and is immortal!!—Here, surely, are flights of interpretation, worthy even of *Unitarian* wing. Here, too, not only is the *future* let in, to the perfect satisfaction of the Unitarians; but to their equal satisfaction, our Lord Jesus Christ is altogether thrust out. There is a freedom, likewise, from *all* ancient prejudices, which might recommend particularly to their notice the former of these writers, who has discovered, that our Saviour and his apostles preached in *Latin*; and that almost all the classical productions, ascribed to the great writers of antiquity, are monkish forgeries of the middle ages. He possesses in a word that towering quality of "*thinking for himself*," the grand characteristic by which Unitarians seek to be distinguished, and which manifestly must belong to all such as can find no others to *think with them*. Whether the latter has distinguished himself by equally free exercises of his genius, I know not: but

edly asserted in the Scriptures." (See *Calm Inq.* p. 458.) Agreeably to their usual mode of proceeding, then, it becomes necessary to disturb the true

both seem worthy to assist Unitarians in their critical researches after truth.

A couple of pages back, some conjectural reasons were assigned in this note, for the change of the original intention, formed by the Unitarians, of making Wakefield's translation of the N. T. the basis of theirs. Many parts of his Version, it was there hinted, it would have puzzled them much to accommodate to their favourite scheme: and then it being necessary to speak in unqualified terms, of the superior learning, of the only scholar they had got amongst them; and besides he being of that description of Critic, who *can never be wrong*, but with whom all is *certain* and *undeniable* that he affirms, it would have defeated their purpose, to have employed him as a constant fellow labourer; since, in that case, they could not have upheld both him and their system. One must, necessarily, have been sacrificed to the other. But, by their present plan, both are judiciously preserved. He is called in, wherever he happens to coincide with the Editors; and then he comes forward, as if he bore the very Urim and Thummim on his breast,—learned, profound, and incontrovertible,—and he is prudently forgotten, on those more numerous occasions, where his appearance would be unseasonable. One instance may be sufficient, to give an idea, of the difficulties, which the Editors would have frequently to experience, not only in their contests with Mr. Wakefield's CERTAINTIES, but in the contests among those CERTAINTIES themselves. I the more willingly advert to it, because it brings to view, another important testimony from the words of Scripture, in support of the general doctrine, maintained throughout this and the foregoing notes, and the NUMBER to which they are annexed.

On John xii. 41, "These things said Isaiah, when he saw his Glory," &c. Mr. Wakefield observes,—“the PROPER ANTECEDENT to *αυτου* MOST CERTAINLY is *Jesus*, he being the *Predicate* of the context.” (*Enquiry*, &c. p. 135.)—Again “*αυτου* MUST BE interpreted of *God*, and NOT of *Jesus*”—“the Lord—the King—Jehovah of hosts,” “is the ONLY ANTECEDENT to *αυτου* :” and he adds, “This appears to be UNDENIABLE.” (*New Test.* i. 398.) Now, as that, which is CERTAIN, cannot well be supposed, in the mind which perceives that *certainly*, to differ from that, which appears to

and natural meaning of each individual text that offers this evidence; that so it may be pronounced, that no such evidence exists. And, in this view, the

the same mind to be UNDENIALE, it should follow, that Mr. Wakefield has here established the identity of CHRIST with the JEHOVAH of the O. T. which is exactly, what, the orthodox maintain to be the true import of the passage before us. This, however, cannot for a moment be admitted, by the Unitarian Editors; who strain every nerve to prove, that this cannot possibly be the meaning of the text; and who must consequently contend, that, what Mr. Wakefield saw to be CERTAINLY TRUE, directly *denied* that, which he also saw to be UNDENIALE. It was at different times, it must indeed be confessed. But then, what he saw at *each* time, was (in the usual Unitarian style,) "CERTAIN;" WAS "UNDENIALE." He is, indeed, entirely their own in every thing, but as possessing some little matter of learning; or, I should rather say,—of *scholarship*.—On the passage just alluded to, our Unitarian Editors have, according to custom, falsified their authorities, by a partial quotation. They have quoted Dr. Clarke upon it, *as if he exactly agreed with them*; while in the rest of his observations upon this text, (on which they are *discreetly silent*,) he is employed in proving, that *Christ* is here and elsewhere described in the O. T. as appearing and speaking in the *name and person of the Father*. (Script. Doct. 3d ed. pp. 16. 109—112.) Mr. Belsham, indeed, goes more *directly* to work than the Editors; for he makes Dr. Clarke maintain the direct contrary of this doctrine, which in express terms and repeatedly that writer labours to establish. (Calm Inq. p. 213.) Mr. Lindsey had before done the same. (Sequel, &c. pp. 353, 354.) It is of great importance, in ascertaining the true character of these writers, to shew how grossly they have misrepresented Dr. Clarke. I shall therefore, beg the reader's particular attention, to a few remarks on this head; especially as they bear directly upon the present subject.

They quote Dr. Clarke, for the purpose of shewing, that they have *his* authority in saying, that, from this passage of Isaiah, no argument can be drawn, in favour of Christ's personal appearance in the time of the Prophets: for, that Dr. Clarke, like the Unitarians, but "understands the Evangelist as affirming, That the Prophet saw, that is, *presaw*, the glory of Christ, as Abraham saw, i. e. *presaw* his day. Joh. viii. 56." (See Calm Inq. p. 213.)—Now, to begin with the illustration, and to prove, how far, the *foreseeing* of Christ's day by Abraham proves it to be Dr. Clarke's opinion, that *Christ* was not *seen* by Abra-

text before us unavoidably became a prominent object of their attention. Christ is, here, plainly spoken of, as existing, and exercising the functions

ham, in the plain sense of the words, take Dr. Clarke's own expressions.—“Acts vii. 2. *The God of glory appeared unto our Father Abraham.*—Not that any man hath seen *the Father*, &c. But God appeared to Abraham *by Christ*; or Christ APPEARED to him in the *name and person*, in the *authority and representation* of the Father.” (Scr. Doct. p. 47. 3d. ed.) Thus, we may be satisfied, how far Dr. Clarke's use of the phrase, of Abraham's *foreseeing Christ's day*, interfered with his belief, that *Christ was personally seen by Abraham*. Whether the same writer then, meant, in speaking of Isaiah's *foreseeing the glory of Christ's coming*, to intimate, that Christ did not *visibly appear*, and exhibit his *personal glory*, to the prophet, we may now reasonably judge.—But Dr. Clarke has not left the matter depending upon any inference however obvious. He follows up the very passage, which the Unitarians have quoted, with these words, on which those writers have taken care to be rigidly silent. “FURTHER;” (that is, in confirmation of the main point, which he had before meant to impress, in the very passage quoted by the Editors; namely, that Isaiah did, “when he saw the *glory of God the Father*,” actually “*then see the Glory of Him*, who was to come in the *Glory of his Father*,” i. e. that he then saw the *Glory of Christ himself*: in confirmation of this, I repeat, he says,—“FURTHER; it is the constant doctrine, of *all the primitive writers* of the Church, that *every appearance of God the Father* in the Old Testament, WAS Christ appearing in the name or person of the Father, [*ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*] in the form of God, as being the image of the invisible God, Col. i. 15; of Him whom no man hath seen at any time, Joh. i. 18,” &c. We can now judge, whether Dr. Clarke's sentence has so happily conveyed the sense of the Unitarians, as they have assured us it has. Or, rather, we may now see, that they have *totally and knowingly* perverted its meaning, in order that they might impose on the unsuspecting reader, their own corruptions of Scripture, under a respectable name. The truth is, that Dr. Clarke conceived, and very justly, that his meaning could not be *mistaken* in the passage, which the Editors have quoted. He had, before, on a variety of texts, so fully explained *every appearance of the glory of God*, as a *real appearance of Christ*, that he could not imagine, that the second sentence, in which he speaks of the prophet's being made to foresee the glory of Christ's *future coming*, could overturn, what, (according to that explanation so frequently repeated,) he had distinctly laid

of Deity, in the Jewish dispensation: and therefore, the sense of this passage must be undermined, and at the same time Newcome must be *forgotten*.

down, in the first, concerning the vision which the prophet actually had of Christ's then *present glory*. And, well, indeed, he might have imagined this. His meaning could not be, and it has not been, *mistaken*. That is not the charge to be brought against the Unitarian application of it. However, as justice must be done to all parties, I am compelled here to state, that in the *Animadversions by a Student*, (p. 84.) the accusation advanced against the Editors, of having fabricated the second of the two sentences which they have quoted from Dr. Clarke, is entirely unfounded. They have quoted the passage fairly: but they have undoubtedly turned it to a most dishonest account.

I cannot avoid travelling a little farther with Dr. Clarke, since the Unitarians have brought us upon this ground. He quotes the following passage from Bishop Bull. "Wherever," (throughout the O. T.) "it was not a mere angel, but GOD HIMSELF, that appeared; there, according to the *unanimous opinion of all primitive antiquity*, we constantly affirm, that it was not THE FATHER, but THE SON." This position Dr. Clarke adopts, and proceeds to confirm. "Thus," (he adds,) "when it is said of Moses and the seventy Elders, Ex. xxiv. 10, that *they saw the God of Israel*, and that *there was under his feet as it were a paved work*, &c. it must be understood that they saw, not the Invisible Father, but THE SON, *appearing in the name and person of the Father*. All which is much confirmed by St. Stephen's expression, Acts vii. 30, 32, that *the Angel of the Lord*, [viz. the *Angel of the Covenant, the Angel of his presence, in whom the name of God was, and by whom God always speaks, upon which account he is stiled, ο Λογος του Θεου, the Word of God,*] appeared to Moses in the Wilderness in a flame of fire in a bush;—saying, *I AM the God of thy Fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*," &c. (ibid. pp. 111. 112.) In agreement with what is here affirmed, by Bishop Bull, and Dr. Clarke, we have accordingly, the multiplied testimonies of the Fathers. We have Theophilus of Antioch, saying, that it was the WORD OF GOD, that talked with Adam in Paradise, in *the person of God*. We have Irenæus, saying, that the WORD OF GOD did, in his divine and glorious character, converse with the patriarchs before Moses, and with those under the Law, &c. and again, that the Scripture is full of the SON OF GOD appearing—to talk with Abraham—to instruct Noah—to seek Adam—to bring judg-

In addition to the reasons arising from the general subject of the passage, there is one part of the Primate's translation, that the Editors could not in con-

ment on Sodom—to direct Jacob in the way—to converse with Moses in the Bush, &c. We have Tertullian saying, that the WORD OF GOD which is called HIS SON, appeared in divers manners to the Patriarchs IN THE NAME OF GOD, and *always spake to the prophets*. And finally, not to tire the reader with a multitude of instances, we have Cyril of Jerusalem, saying, of the very passage in Isaiah, of which we have been treating, “The FATHER hath no man seen at any time; but HE, *which THEN APPEARED to the prophet, was THE SON.*” (Catech. 14.)—Now, when I tell the reader, that THIS is one of the passages from the Fathers, which Dr. Clarke has cited, for the purpose of confirming the justice of *his own* opinion, upon the text of Isaiah, he will surely be completely satisfied, as to the fairness of the Unitarian critics, who have alleged Dr. Clarke's opinions and comment on *this* text, in support of *their* views of it, whereby they endeavour to overturn every thing which he has asserted and maintained. In examining this point, we have seen what is the *unanimous opinion of all primitive antiquity* (as Bishop Bull and Dr. Clarke express it,) upon the subject of Christ's appearance in the times of the Old Testament. The Bishop, indeed, goes so far, (and with Dr. Clarke's concurrence,) as to affirm, that “all those appearances under the Old Testament, wherein the name *Jehovah* and divine honours are given to the person that appeared, (notwithstanding that perhaps he be only called an Angel,) are understood, by the FATHERS OF THE FIRST AGES, as belonging to the SON OF GOD: and that “HE THAT KNOWS NOT THIS IS A STRANGER IN THE WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS.” (Scrip. Doct. pp. 121. 125.)

To put Bishop Bull and Dr. Clarke, and *all antiquity* to the blush, I shall here repeat, what the Calm Inquirer, and his Unitarian fellow labourers of the present day, *pronounce*, and of course from real knowledge of the subject:—“that there is *no evidence whatever* to prove, that Christ was personally concerned in any of the former dispensations of God to mankind, either to the patriarchs or to the Jews, but that the *contrary is explicitly and repeatedly asserted in the Scriptures.*” Here is the whole of the case. Thus say the Fathers, and the whole Christian world on the one hand. And thus say the persons calling themselves *Unitarians*, on the other.—*Utrum horum mavis.*—One thing seems obviously to be inferred, that the latter do not use the *same scriptures* with the former. That is precisely, what,

sistency but reject—"HIM WHO WAS FROM HEAVEN:" this declaration of CHRIST'S *descent from heaven*, being directly subversive of all that they and their coadjutors have most anxiously laboured to establish. See pp. 243. 283—304. and especially 293—295. of this volume: in which we have particularly noticed, the extraordinary efforts of these Unitarian critics, to escape* from the clear declarations of

the greater part of these volumes is intended to prove. The course, which Unitarians have pursued, is whimsical enough. The received Scriptures, such as they have been transmitted from the Apostolic times, not giving support to their system, it was thought right, at one time, to try, what could be collected from the Fathers, in favour of their object: and the writings of the Fathers were, accordingly, resorted to in place of Scripture, for the purpose of ascertaining certain doctrines to be the doctrines of scripture, although they could not be found in the Scripture itself. Mr. Lindsey's attempts in this way, were soon baffled by Mr. Burgh, and others. An able disputant succeeded Mr. Lindsey, in the person of Dr. Priestley; who modelled the argument from the Fathers, into what he conceived a less vulnerable shape. Bishop Horsley, however, proved, by the total discomfiture of Dr. Priestley, that this new mode of travelling to the doctrines of Scripture through the Fathers, (if new indeed that can be called which is but an old Popish contrivance,) was as unfavourable to Unitarianism as the Scriptures themselves. A recent, but feeble attempt has, indeed, been made to re-combine and re-place some of the shattered arguments, which the Bishop of St. David's had beaten down, But, by the present learned successor to the Bishop in that see, they have been again overwhelmed in their former confusion. The writings of the Fathers have, of course, fallen in the estimation of their Unitarian admirers; who now feel it rather a dangerous matter to appeal to their authority. But that they may not be thrown back again upon the Scripture, which had before proved ruinous to their cause, they have fashioned to their own purpose, a manual which they *call* Scripture: and now they are fully prepared to set FATHERS, and APOSTLES, and EVANGELISTS, and PROPHETS, *all* fairly at defiance.

* Their mode of *escape* here, is, as we have seen, by rendering the words, *τον απ ουρανου*, "him [God] speaking from heaven." Now, as we have found it quite a hopeless case, to discuss with these critics the propriety of their translations, we

Scripture,—that our Lord came down from heaven, and that he descended from a divine state, to fulfil the objects of his heavenly mission. It will also,

have only to attend to the instruction, which they are pleased to give us respecting their true import and application. In endeavouring, however, to discover the meaning, which the Editors attach to their rendering of this clause, the reader, I apprehend, will find himself a little puzzled. For, as they inform us, God is here said to “speak from heaven by the gifts of the holy spirit:”—or as Mr. Belsham (the principal Editor) expresses it, “by his” (God’s) “spirit:” (Calm. Inq. p. 162.) or as it is in 1 Pet. i. 12. (to which the Editors refer us in their note,) “through the holy spirit sent down from heaven.” As to Mr. Lindsey, to whom the note also directs us for the explanation of these words, he says not one word about the matter, but simply recites the quotation from Peirce, to shew, that it is not *Christ* but *God*, that is the subject. But, as I have already said, this explanation of the Editors only puzzles the question. For, we are told in the very same page, that, “the spirits of men are men themselves; in page 541, that the souls of men, are the men themselves. *The holy spirit*, or the *spirit of God*, must therefore in like manner be *God himself*. And so indeed we are distinctly informed at p. 447, and still more distinctly at p. 505. (where the Editors have with their usual accuracy, directly reversed the just position of their own quotations, 1 Cor. ii. 11. and 2 Tim. iv. 22.) “The word *spirit* is a Hebraism to express a person’s self”—the spirit of a man is a man himself: the *spirit of God* is *God himself*.”—There is, however, it must be noted, one exception to this established rule of interpretation, this well known *Hebraism*! namely, the case of *Christ*. At the use of this word, all rules and idioms vanish. *The spirit of a man is a man himself: the spirit of God is God himself*: but beware, here stops the *Hebraism*; the *spirit of Christ* is not *Christ himself*; for then, as Mr. Lindsey admits, we should have a plain proof of Christ’s pre-existence, from 1 Pet. i. 10: and therefore the Editors inform us, on this passage, that the *spirit of Christ*, is the *spirit which prophesied concerning Christ!!* Well then, God speaking from heaven by his spirit, or by his holy spirit, is—*God himself* speaking from heaven: so that his speaking from heaven, actually means his speaking from heaven. This is plain enough at all events. But, again, a great difficulty arises, as to the auxiliary passage, which speaks of this “holy spirit sent down from heaven;” because, then, it remains to be explained, how *God himself* has been sent down

from what has been laid down in the passages there alluded to, not appear surprising, that the Editors, having here again departed from the Primate upon

from heaven, and by whom he had been so sent down. Whether this be the precise point, that is said to have remained a difficulty to the "Angels," I know not: but certain it is, that to those "*messengers*" of whom the Editors speak in this verse, and who, they say, are meant by the word "Angels," it must indeed remain a difficulty. (I. V. p. 541.)

In truth the jumble of *Angels*, *Spirits*, and *Heaven*, which is tossed about through the pages of the Unitarian Version, and of its principal annotator, the Calm Inquirer, is a thing altogether without example. There are ANGELS, and there are *not* ANGELS. DISEMBODED SPIRITS are *admitted* and *denied*. There is *no* actual HEAVEN, and yet there is a HEAVEN spoken of as familiarly as if its existence were believed in. Mr. Belsham, indeed, after having protested against the existence of *Angels* with all his might, has been brought by the Bishop of St. David's to confess, that he does not altogether give them up. What, as he now says, he means to deny, is merely a *hierarchy* among them. HIERARCHIES! (odious word, the very sound of it provokes hostility!)—HIERARCHIES! are what he cannot admit, even among *Angels*. Allow him but a good bustling DEMOCRACY among the angelic tribes, and he is at once satisfied, to concede the existence, of as many of that order of Beings, as the most orthodox can desire. (Review of the Brief Memorial, pp. 105—107. 111.) However, after all, he cannot very easily discover the existence, any more than the hierarchy, of angels *in scripture*; but he is led to the admission, not only of the *possibility*, but of the *fact*, from *philosophy*.—There is, indeed, it must be observed, an excellent reason, why Mr. B. as well as his brother Editors, should admit the existence of *Angels*, as "Beings of an order superior to mankind:" viz. that our Lord is pronounced in Hebr. ii. 7, 9. to have been made *lower* than the Angels. This single consideration has, I have no doubt, with Unitarians, preserved this order of Beings from total extermination. But then, unfortunately, this same sacred writer has, also, pronounced of our Lord, that he was *greater* than the angels, and that even the angels of God were to worship him. This matter, however, is thus easily explained to us by the Editors.—"This writer, having already proved, that Christ was *superior* to ANGELS, viz. to *all preceding prophets and messengers* from God, now proceeds to prove, that he is in his nature *inferior* to ANGELS, considered as *Beings of an order superior to mankind*, for that the nature of his com-

this vital subject, should here again be *profoundly silent* upon this departure. The suppression noticed under the head of Number III. has exactly

mission required that he should be a proper human being. *It is no objection that he uses the word Angel in a different sense without giving notice of the change. Such inaccuracies of style are not uncommon in the sacred writers!!!*" (I. V. p. 505. and Calm. Inq. p. 396.) Now, there is a comical hardihood in this last sentence, that puts every thing like gravity or seriousness to flight. The Apostle has used one and the same word Ἀγγελος, ANGEL, uniformly throughout. In honest simplicity the writer meant nothing different from what he said; and as he never dreamed of any change in the use of the expression, so consequently he could give no notice of any. Oh! but, says the Unitarian Editor, according to my hypothesis, *I must, by the word "ANGEL," understand prophet, wherever Christ is said to be superior to angels: and, by the word "ANGEL" again, I must understand angel, wherever he is said to be inferior to angels: and, as to this change in the meaning of the word "ANGEL," the reader must not be at all surprised; FOR, this change, in which I have indulged, and with which the writer is in no way concerned, is but an incorrectness of style not uncommon in—THE SACRED WRITERS!!!*" Does the person who peruses this, believe his eyes? And will he credit me, when I assure him, that the writers of this note exhibit no symptoms of openly laughing at their readers?

In truth, to show the monstrous and overwhelming absurdities, into which the system of these writers unavoidably drags them, I would desire no more, than that the reader should carefully examine the first two chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the Imp. Vers. together with the notes; and the auxiliary remarks, in the 6th sect. of part first of the Calm Inquiry. If there be produced, in any other work, now extant, an equal range of downright and irremediable nonsense, I am ready to admit the I. V. to be a fair version, and the Calm Inquiry to be a candid, sensible, and learned performance. In a word, what the Calm Inquirer, and his brother Editors, have given us upon this part of the N. T. is altogether too ludicrous for sober animadversion. What has been already bestowed upon their extravagancies, by the Bishop of St. David's, and Dr. Nares, might be deemed so much of good criticism thrown away, if it were not, that there is no folly which there are not fools to embrace, if it be not contradicted. I shall notice but one single point, because it will help forward the due estimate

the same bearing with that which has taken place here. Thus the *accidental* departures from Newcome, which are of course *unacknowledged*, fall

to be formed, of the knowledge, possessed by the Calm Inquirer and his brother Editors, of the original language, of the book, which they have ventured to translate. ΕΛΑΤΤΩ they render, (as they ought,) to 'make lower.' ΗΛΑΤΤΩΣΑΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ, *thou madest him lower*. Then the passive of this verb, ΕΛΑΤΤΩΜΑΙ they pronounce, is not properly to 'be made lower,' but to 'be lower;' and still more, to *be so by nature*, so as to exclude all idea, of any change wrought, or any act exerted. ΤΟΝ ΔΕ ΗΛΑΤΤΩΜΕΝΟΝ *him who was lower*; "not who was MADE, who WAS, i. e. by nature," *lower*. Thus, of the same person it is asserted, *thou madest him lower*, and yet that he was NOT *made* lower, but *was* lower by nature. An action is exerted upon a person, and yet this person is NOT the subject, on which the action is exerted: but *is* naturally that, which he is said to be *made* to be. See I. V. Hebr. ii. 7. 9. and Calm Inq. p. 397.) These transcendentals of grammar, which soar so far above the ordinary rules, will be better understood, when it is recollected, that they assist in overturning the doctrine of our Lord's pre-existence. But is it not disgusting, to see such persons, imposing on the unlearned, what they pretend to be an *Improved Version of the New Testament*?

As to the notions entertained by the Editors concerning *spirits*, it is not quite easy to determine; for whilst they speak of the spirit of a man, as the man himself; and, where *spirits* in a separate state are manifestly intended, (as in Hebr. xii. 24.) carefully guard us against thinking of "*disembodied spirits*;" yet, in several parts of the N. T. in which *spirits* in a separate state are undoubtedly meant, they familiarly use the word *spirit*, as if they conformed to the usual acceptance.—The Calm Inquirer, also, is similarly cautious upon this subject; and indeed, he affirms in his answer to the Brief Memorial, (p. 107.) that he has given no opinion of the nature of *spirits*. Whether he has formally done so, I shall not waste time to enquire; but, undoubtedly, his language at page 209, of his Calm Inquiry, seems to convey something like an opinion against their separate existence. His known sentiments on *materialism*, also, may justify the supposition, that when he affirms, that "the word *spirit* does not necessarily signify an *incorporeal* being," he only wishes to prepare the reader, for the admission of the idea, that the word never can carry such a meaning. However, it seems but justice to this writer, to

wonderfully together, on the same important topic : and would certainly form a curious subject of calculation, for a person competent to such enquiries,

make known the recantation, which he has lately read, on the subject of *materialism* itself. So far from being an AVOWED MATERIALIST, as he had been by all the world conceived to be, and as a friend of forty years acquaintance and social intercourse, has, within these few months, pronounced him to be, he now solemnly declares—what? that he does not himself know, whether he is or not. He cannot make out exactly, whether he is to rank with Dr. Price or Dr. Priestley. At length, however, he begins to apprehend, that he should be placed somewhere *between* the two. That he should so easily give up Dr. Priestley, whose principal of *materialism*, supplies as he himself exults (in his Introductory Letter to Dr. Horsley) “a short and plain argument, conclusive against the doctrine of A SOUL, and consequently against the whole system of PRE-EXISTENCE,” seems indeed surprising. Yet so it is. He cannot now concur with Dr. Priestley, nor yet with Dr. Price. He is *neither* MATERIALIST *nor* IMMATERIALIST; but finds himself at an intermediate point removed from both. He confesses indeed, that he is “not *metaphysician* enough, to determine,” where this point lies: and therefore he resorts to *Mathematics* that he may avail himself of its clearness; and, by the aid of this science, he discovers his *true position* to be, in THE CENTRE OF OSCILLATION!!! This must, surely, satisfy the reader at once. His true position is hereby accurately ascertained.—It only remains to solve the problem of finding this centre. But as the *figure* of the swinging body is necessary to determine this point scientifically, and the *time* of the swing to determine it mechanically, quære, has Mr. Belsham supplied sufficient data for the solution? But, in truth, there is abundant reason to pronounce, that the Calm Inquirer is perfectly innocent of all knowledge, of what this same *centre of oscillation* actually is. It is manifest, that he has some confused notion, of its being some *fixed* point between the extremes of oscillation; and not the least idea, that it occupies successively *every* point in the curve through which the body oscillates, including the extremes themselves. That the *family* of the Botherims in *Morals* and *Metaphysics*, (See p. 152 of this vol.) should be connected with that of the Malaprops in *Mathematics*, is not surprising. But to be serious, which, where this writer is concerned, it is not always an easy matter to accomplish, why will Mr. Belsham so often meddle with what he does not un-

and disposed to exercise his skill in the *Doctrine of Chances*.

I have now, I trust, made good the charge, which in a former edition, had been advanced against the Unitarian Editors, respecting their disingenuous use of the name* of Archbishop Newcome. For

derstand? As an apology to such of my readers, as may impute to me a blameable levity, in some of the allusions in this note, I entreat their perusal of Mr. Belsham's letter, in the Number of the Monthly Repository, for Dec. 1815; (Vol. x. p. 746.) by which, if I mistake not very much, the effect produced upon the muscles of the gravest, will supply an excuse for that which, it is unnecessary for me to confess, has been produced on mine. The reader will there find, also, an attempt on the part of Mr. Belsham, to run away from his avowed opinions on the observance of the Lord's day, as well as from those, on the subject of *Materialism*. What he *has* said upon this subject, he may to be sure, formally retract: but, whilst he merely contends, that, what he has said, is *consistent* with the *Christian* observance of the day, the opinions generally attributed to him, and which are unavoidably deducible from his own statements referred to at pp. 361, 362, of this volume, will stick, like the poisoned shirt. It would, indeed, be a matter of much satisfaction, to observe the Unitarians thus anxiously disclaiming the irreligious and profane consequences of their system, which they formerly maintained with open triumph; were it not, as appears from this letter, and their other late publications, that this is done solely, *ad captum*, and to remove the impediments, which such revolting avowals have thrown in the way of the *proselyting system*, in which they have lately engaged.

* The views, with which the Unitarians have selected the Primate's Version as the basis of theirs, have, I apprehend, by this time been made sufficiently apparent. They indeed *profess* to have selected it, on account of its general *accuracy*, *simplicity*, and *fidelity*, as well as its conformity to *Griesbach's* Greek text: their object being, (as they tell us) to present to the public, an *Improved Version*, and a *Corrected Text*. How far these were their real views, will easily be collected, when it is considered, that in almost every passage of the N. T. in which the Unitarian theory is affected, these qualities of "*accuracy*, *simplicity*, and *fidelity*," are found to be wanting in the Primate, whilst they adhere to him in every other. In these parts, of course, he is deserted by the *Editors*; but in all others

the charge, as it originally stood, I refer the reader to p. 196 of this volume: for the manner in which the Unitarians endeavour to repel it, I refer him to

he is followed, indeed, with a "scrupulous fidelity," as the CALM INQUIRER expresses it: a *fidelity*, by which they evince their true object, as manifestly, as by their *desertion*; inasmuch, as it equally tends to prove, that, to render the version of the N. T. *more correct*, was not the end, at which they aimed, but merely to *convert the Primate's Translation to Unitarian purposes*. This inference we are unavoidably compelled to make, unless we can be brought to believe, that the Primate is *always* correct, *save only* where the *Unitarian* question is involved. The *Editors*, it is true, might lead us to suppose, that *they* are impressed with this belief; for, in all but the places here excepted, we find them following him to the utmost exactness, even in his *errors*; or, indeed, we may say, copying him right forward, without once pausing, to see, whether the Version agreed with the original or not. So that, in truth, one might be tempted to imagine, that, all that portion of the Primate's Version, which did not touch on the one important subject, was left to the mere printer's compositor, to set the type to as it stood; whilst the remaining part was reserved, only to undergo that revision of these learned *Editors*, which was necessary, to *CORRECT* it INTO *Unitarianism*.

Whether this be an unlikely supposition, may be judged, when it is known, that even the *ERRORS* in the *printing* of the *Primate's* book, are *exactly* copied into the *IMPROVED Version*: and the very mistakes, which the *Primate* has noticed, in his *list of Errata*, are carefully retained. Of the degree, to which this negligence is carried, one example may be a sufficient proof. In Hebr. vii. 4. where it is said of Melchisedec, that he, "resembling the Son of God continueth A PRIEST perpetually," *μενει κεινος εις το ειναι ιερεα*, the *Primate*, (or his printer,) omitting, by mistake, the words marked in capitals, has it, "continueth perpetually:" and accordingly, these *Editors*, who are looking only, as they tell us, after an *IMPROVED Version*, have it the same. Did they here follow the *Primate* implicitly, *neglecting the original*? Or, did they, after a careful attention to the original, fall, by mere mistake, into the *same error* with the *Primate*? Or did *their* printer make the *same slip* that *his* made? Here, again, the doctrine of chances puzzles us as much, about the agreement, as before we have found it frequently to do, about the departure. This, together with numerous other errors and alterations, the *Primate* has. in-

p. 238—243: whilst, in the pages from 480 to this, he will find examples and proofs in support of the allegation, selected from an ample and disgusting

deed, noticed in a list at the end of his Book. But, as the *Editors* of the IMPROVED *Version*, had not even taken the trouble to look to the end, until they came to it in the course of printing, the thing could not be remedied. The *Primate's list* could not, with any decency, be supplied at the conclusion; as this would be too barefaced an avowal of the total disregard of accuracy, and of the entire dependence upon Newcome to the neglect of the original, which accompanied them throughout *those parts of the work in which they felt no peculiar interest*. And, therefore, we really have, at this moment, independently of the perversions of Scripture in certain parts, a *less correct* translation of the N. T. in this IMPROVED *Version*, than we had before in that of Newcome, on which it professes to improve.

But, yet more, we have a part of that grand display of their learning and of their acquaintance with the sources of biblical knowledge, which is exhibited by the *Editors* in their Introduction, copied almost verbatim from Newcome. This was *more* than they had promised. They had engaged, only, to follow his *translation*. But they had not engaged, to deal out matter of biblical instruction, to their readers, from the *Primate*. Yet they execute this, for which they did not contract, even more faithfully than the former for which they did. And, it must be said, they are as little ostentatious, of their transcribing from the *Primate*, here; as they were, of their occasionally departing from him, there. They have, here, given all in their own name: and given honestly, as they found it, with all its errors and deficiencies, exactly as it stood in the *Primate's* Book. The effect, indeed, of this *fac simile* procedure, is, in some respects, comical enough. By it, the INTRODUCTION has been actually converted into APPENDIX, from the accident of the word "APPENDIX" being prefixed to that part, at the end of the *Primate's* book, which has been copied by the *Editors* into the *beginning* of theirs.

But, yet farther, they have by the same means arrived at the discovery of a NEW HERESY in early times; of which neither Irenæus or Epiphanius among the ancients, nor Ittigius or Lardner among the moderns, seem to have had the smallest idea: the CORINTHIAN *heresy!!!* They tell us, that St. John's Gospel was written, "to confute the *Corinthian* and other heresies." This, it will be apprehended, is a mere mistake for CERINTHIAN. And originally it was so undoubtedly. But, let

abundance. And if, whilst I have been employed in establishing this charge, evidence has arisen, of artifice, and dishonesty, not only, in their application

it not be imagined, that the *Editors* of the *IMPROVED Version* could have fallen into any such mistake. They were too careful for that. They have copied it steadily from Newcome; in whose book, the word *Cerinthian*, used by Dr. Owen, has been so misprinted.

They have, likewise, in the list of *Lexicons* useful for the New Testament, paid Newcome the compliment, of adopting *his* list exactly: leaving out the *very* lexicon, to which they and their coadjutors constantly refer, as being decidedly of the highest authority: the lexicon of Schleusner. It is true, it is of the value they have ascribed to it. But, then, it had not been named by Newcome: and although they make no *boast* of following the *Primate* in this part of their work, yet they could not prevail upon themselves to depart from him here in a single iota.

Again, as they have followed Newcome in a defective list of *Lexicons* for the N. T. so they have been led by him into an erroneous list of *Concordances* for the same. They are so *very* particular, as to mention the *Concordance* of "*Robert Stephens, 1599.*" There is no such *Concordance*. *Robert Stephens* died forty years before that date. The *Concordance* was by *Henry Stephens*. These being both authors of great celebrity ought not to be confounded. The mistake, it is true indeed, is not much. But, coupled with the affectation of *precise knowledge*, (even to the use of the Christian name,) for the purpose of *accurate instruction* to the *less learned*; and being, after all, the plagiarism of a blunder, where originality is professed, and the airs of commanding acquaintance with the sources of biblical information familiarly assumed; the thing is ridiculous in itself, and becomes just of so much consequence, as it is symptomatic of the nature of the work, and the character of its authors. For the part, to which these latter observations apply, see their *Introduction*, pp. xxxi. xxxii. and the greater part of p. xxxiii. to which I beg the reader's particular attention.

Thus, we see, that the conduct of the *Editors*, with respect to their professed model Newcome, has upon the whole, been either that of *slavish adherence*, or of *treacherous desertion*. The former, wherever there was no interest in the latter. But as to concern for the *truth*, or fidelity to the *original*, of these we can find no trace. Correctness and improvement form no part of the object. Adaptation to the purposes of a *party*, (it can

of the Primate's name, but in their treatment of other authorities, bearing on those parts of Scripture, which vitally affect the Unitarian question: if,

scarcely be called a *sect*,) is the only thing held in view. Newcome, where these purposes cannot be served by deserting him, is servilely copied, (with all his errors,) to obtain his name, or to appropriate the fruits of his industry, and the credit of his learning. We have in short, *Newcome's Testament moulded into Unitarianism*; that is *emptied of CHRISTIANITY*: and this is the IMPROVED VERSION, whereby the Editors promise us a new era in biblical knowledge. Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo!!

Indeed, the reason for adopting Newcome's version, has been pretty plainly confessed, in a recent publication, by one of the principal writers among the Unitarians, to have been of the description, which has been contended for, in this note, and elsewhere throughout this appendix. After stating of course, that the Unitarians deemed the Primate's translation to be the best, he adds, as the important point,—“You cannot wound the Unitarians, but *through the sides of an eminent prelate of your own church.*” Here, indeed, we have a glimpse of the true state of the case. And to make the Unitarian Version appear, as much as possible, (consistently with the real object,) identified with the Primate's, all has been arranged in the manner which we have just described. No departures have been expended, but upon some point that would tell. The same writer has informed us, that “the *Improved Version* is only a republication of the work of Archbishop Newcome, with no variation in the text, but such as is sanctioned by the last corrected Greek text of Griesbach, and explained in the margin. The *paring, garbling, and mutilation*, therefore, of which you complain, is to be laid at the door of the Archbishop and Griesbach, who have *ventured*, audacious men! to prefer truth to prejudice, and to set the interests of sacred literature above those of any particular church.” (A plea for Unitarian Dissenters, by Robert Aspland,—p. 75.) Such is the latest account given of this matter, and by a writer, who takes a distinguished lead in the direction of Unitarian concerns. We see, then, that now we are to consider the Unitarian Version, as a *mere transcript of Newcome*, with a few improvements from the CORRECTED TEXT OF GRIEBACH. The IMPROVED VERSION, therefore, is but the consolidation of Newcome and Griesbach. Of this, the reader is, by this time, qualified to judge, who has seen, that both are constantly abandoned, when they fail to answer the *Unitarian purpose*: and that New-

in their exposition of those parts of Scripture, numerous instances have appeared, of falsehoods in quotation, of fallacies and blunders in reasoning, of rashness and ignorance in criticism, of confidence in assumption, of unblushing hardihood in assertion; in a word, of all the various means, and contrivances, by which, bad faith, unchecked by learning, and unabashed by shame, is used to mislead the uninformed, and delude the unsuspecting: I trust, also, that I shall stand acquitted of improper severity, in the terms, in which the charge was originally expressed; and that, what the Editors, in the person of the CALM INQUIRER, (who is acknowledged as their advocate,) have complained of as *coarse language*, the reader will admit to be nothing more than the language of *plain truth*; and that he will be disposed to offer for me, the apology, that Philip did for those, who are described, as being in the habit of calling a spade a spade.

Should this be the case, the exertions of the CALM INQUIRER, in vindication of the Editors, will but have served, like every effort of what is weak in defence of what is wrong, the more to expose what it was the object to conceal: and the extent of their obligations for his services, will amount to this,—that, from the closer inspection of the subject, which he has provoked, stronger proof has appeared, of *their* unfitness for the work which they had undertaken; and clearer manifestations have been made, not only that what they profess to give, as an Improved Version of the N. T. is calculated to remove from

come, especially, is frequently abandoned *dishonestly* and in *disguise*: contrary to what the same writer asserts of the “unnoticed variations between Newcome and the Imp. Version,” (for he admits there are such,) namely, that they “are *accidental*, and neither *frequent* nor *important*.”—But still the cry is, “You wound only an eminent Prelate of your own church.”

the mind, every just idea of the original; but also, that, in accomplishing this, they have resorted to such expedients, that if from *them* the religion of Unitarians is to be estimated, it may safely be pronounced to be any thing *but* the religion of TRUTH.

Having gone, so fully, into the subject of the first of the charges brought against the Editors, and into the important matter which it naturally drew into consideration, I am now compelled to touch with more brevity, than I had at first intended, though possibly, at the same time, even yet, bestowing more attention than is deserved, upon the replies, which have been made to the remaining charges, by the advocates of the Unitarian Version.

To the rejection of the first two chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the former on the authority of the *Ebionites*, and the latter on that of *Marcion*, it had been objected, (see p. 198—199 of this vol.) that these early heretics stood convicted of the mutilation of the sacred canon: that, consequently, they were not credible witnesses, as to its genuine contents; and that, therefore, the mere omission, in *their* copies, of any portion of Scripture, otherwise supported by credible testimony, could not affect its genuineness in the least. On this principle, it was contended, that, whilst the genuineness of the chapters in question was attested by *all* the existing* Manuscripts and Versions, the alleged want of

* I must here, take the opportunity, of correcting a mistake, committed by my learned friend Doctor Hales, at the 675th page of the 2nd vol. of his *New Analysis*. He has, there, very truly remarked, that “the two introductions of Matthew’s and Luke’s Gospels are found in *all* the *unmutilated* Greek manuscripts extant; and in *all* the *versions* without exception.” But, he has also said, that “the oldest Greek manuscripts, in uncials, or capital letters, the Alexandrian, Cambridge, Parisian, are imperfect, and want the two introductory Chapters of Matthew.”—Now, this is not the case. The Cambridge, and

them in the respective copies of the *Ebionites* and *Marcion*, could supply no ground whatever for their rejection.

Now, in answer to this reasoning, the arguments offered by the CALM INQUIRER, in defence of the Editors, possess at least an *originality*, which entitles them to notice. One argument is, that these persons, against whom this charge of corrupting the Scriptures has been brought, *have themselves actually declared* their copies to be genuine:* and

the Parisian, both have them; with the exception, in the former, of the first 19 verses and part of the 20th, which however extends only a couple of verses beyond the genealogy: and even of this portion, only the first eleven verses can truly be said, not to exist in the manuscript; because, the first two folios only being lost, we have the latin part of the codex, (it being Græc. Lat.) so far back as the 12th verse. The truth is, that of the four manuscripts in uncials, of acknowledged and distinguished antiquity, the Alexandrian, the Vatican, the Parisian, and the Cambridge, the only one, in which, (with the exception stated as to the Camb. MS.) any mutilation extends to the two introductory chapters of Matthew, is the Alexandrian, which is found imperfect so far as to the 6th verse of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew's Gospel.—I have thought it right, to be thus particular upon this point, lest the authority of so learned a writer as Dr. Hales, should tend, in any degree, to diminish the strength of evidence, supplied by the ancient MSS. to these introductory chapters of St. Matthew. That learned writer, the only object of whose incessant labours is the investigation of truth, is as desirous as I am myself, that the above mistake should be corrected.

* At page 7 of the Address, &c. the reader will find, that one of the circumstances, on which the Calm Inquirer principally relies, for the credibility of the copies of the Ebionites, in opposition to all the existing manuscripts and versions of St. Matthew's Gospel, is, "that these Christians ASSERTED THEIR COPIES TO BE GENUINE." And again, at page 10, he tells us, that Marcion's "enemies accuse him of wilfully corrupting the sacred text, BUT HE DENIES THE CHARGE." Thus we see, that these early heretics had the honest candour, to *confess* their copies to be genuine; even *although* these copies were precisely adapted to their peculiar opinions.—Such testimony who

therefore genuine they must have been.—A second argument, equally ingenious and convincing, is, that, the more they mutilated some parts of scripture, the more anxious they would be, to preserve the rest uncorrupted:† or, to put this in other words, the less honesty they had exercised on certain parts of the sacred canon, the more they would be sure to expend upon what remained:—a principle, involving a discovery in the rules of evidence touching the genuineness of written documents, for which,

can reject, however resisted by the opposing testimony of thousands? I have here argued on the supposition, that these heretics made the declarations, which this writer has ascribed to them. On this we shall see more hereafter.

† “The Ebionites, we are told, rejected the three last Gospels, and all the Epistles of St. Paul. *It may be so.* THEN SURELY THEY WOULD BE THE MORE CAREFUL OF THAT GOSPEL WHICH THEY RETAINED.” Address, &c. pp. 7, 8. On the same principle, also, we find the CALM INQUIRER contending, at p. 10, that Marcion would be THE MORE CAREFUL of the Gospel of St. Luke, as being the only one that *he* retained. But, with respect to the Ebionites particularly, the Calm Inquirer, with that partiality, so natural in behalf of those, to whom the Unitarians so fondly look as their prototypes, enlarges with luxuriancy, as to the perfect state of their copies of St. Matthew. “This Gospel,” he says, “which alone they acknowledged as authentic; this gospel which they would *on no account presume either to enlarge or to curtail*; this *purest copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew*, wanted the TWO FIRST CHAPTERS.” (Address, &c. p. 8.) This *purest copy of Matthew’s Gospel*, wanted THE WHOLE (observe) of the first two chapters. Well, what use do we find the Calm Inquirer again turning this to? Why, to show, that the Editors are perfectly right, in *not* rejecting *the whole* of these chapters; but in retaining a part of them; which, though wanted in this *purest copy*, (on which of course *implicit reliance* is to be placed,) was undoubtedly a *part of genuine scripture*, which these honest Ebionites, who, “would *on no account presume either to enlarge or to curtail*” THIS gospel, are *confessed* to have *actually cut out!!!*—I cannot expect the reader to credit me, in this statement of the reasonings of the Editors, and their Calm Inquirer. Let him compare what the Calm Inquirer has said, with the Editor’s own words, in the first page of their translation.

the Courts of Law must hold themselves entirely indebted to the sagacity of the CALM INQUIRER.—Before we proceed to any of the remaining arguments, it may be right to observe in this place, that none could be more natural, for the chosen advocate of the Editors, to employ, than these, which we have just noticed. On the same principle, with that of their *Ebionite* precursors, *they* are enabled to prove their English copy of the N. T. to be a sound and genuine representation of the original: for, like those ancient heretics, they too can produce, both their *affirmations*, and their *mutilations*, in their support.

The third argument, urged by the CALM INQUIRER, has for its object to prove, that it is perfectly consistent with the principles of historic evidence, that a witness, convicted of falsehood in one part of his testimony, is not thereby rendered the less credible in another. The Editors had proceeded, upon the ground of the rejection of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel by the *Ebionites*: yet, finding it convenient, to retain a *part* of those chapters, (which, as they conceived, favoured the notion of the mere humanity of Christ,) they did not scruple to reject the testimony of those very *Ebionites*, as to this part; and to admit, that, in this part of these two chapters, they had been guilty of mutilation; whilst, on the authority, which had been thus discredited, it was still thought right, to expunge the remainder of the chapters. On this, it seems not extraordinary, to have adverted to the unreasonableness, of “pronouncing the *Ebionite* witnesses, on one side of a leaf, as NOT CREDIBLE, *from their acknowledged mutilation of the sacred text*, and upon the other side of the same leaf, maintaining them to be witnesses of such repute, as ought to be relied upon, in opposition to all the MSS. and all the

Versions of the New Testament in the whole world." (See p. 199. of this vol.)

To reply to this observation, the argument of the CALM INQUIRER is directed. But, as there is something puzzling in the matter, it has been deemed safest, not to enter upon a direct and immediate solution, but to turn aside to a lively historical parallel, and then travel off briskly from the subject, by giving to the whole an agreeable and facetious termination. This ingenious writer, accordingly, after quoting the above passage, (that is, quoting it after the *Unitarian* fashion,—*cutting out the part of it, on which the whole argument is made to turn,**) proceeds to observe:—"We should make fine work of

* The part here alluded to, is the clause, marked in italics, in the last quotation. This clause, the reader will observe, formed the entire foundation of my argument. The *Editors* had contended for the fidelity of the report of the *Ebionites*, concerning the two introductory chapters of Matthew's gospel; they had, at the same time, denied the fidelity of that report, by acknowledging the mutilation of these very chapters by those same *Ebionites*. In this view of the case, it was demanded, whether the Editors would thus reject the *Ebionites* as *not credible*, admitting them to be convicted of the mutilation of these chapters, and yet contend for them, in attestation of *these same chapters, as credible* witnesses, whose authority no counter testimony was sufficient to impeach. Yes, says the CALM INQUIRER, I *do* believe the *Ebionites*, and I *do not* believe them: for, (having first imitated the *Ebionites* by cutting out the part of the passage which hampered him, and having thereby shaped or endeavoured to shape it, to his own purpose,) "in the one case I see reason to concur with them, and in the other to differ from them;" and then, he passes on to the two distinct facts of the Battle of Cannæ and the speaking of the ox, as an exact representation of the case of the *Ebionites*, being supposed at the same time capable and incapable of mutilating the Gospel of St. Matthew; at the same time credible and incredible, respecting the genuineness of the first two chapters of that gospel. It is a curious, but not an inexplicable, fact, that the spirit of mutilation has been in all ages a character of Unitarianism. Take the *old* EBIONITES, or the *new*; it is still the same.

ancient history, if this *Dublin Professor's* principle is to be admitted, believe *all* or *none** without discrimination. Livy relates that Hannibal crossed the Alps, and beat the Romans at the battle of Cannæ; and I believe him. The same Livy tells that an *ox spoke*; but I believe him not." He asks then, "is Livy to be pronounced on one side of the leaf, to be credible, and on the other incredible?" and so goes on, to make himself exceedingly merry,† at

* The Dublin Professor carries his principles even farther than "*believe all or none.*" He is so whimsical as to require of those, with whom he is engaged in discussion, to *quote all or none*, of any passage, which they profess to give as his. But here, the Unitarians contend for unrestrained liberty, as before. They proceed "*with discrimination,*" here likewise; and as they believe and disbelieve just what they think proper, so, (as we have seen in the last note, and in other similar instances without number,) they select and reject from any sentence which they profess to quote, just what they find convenient. It answers the present turn: and satisfies the literary fame, that hopes not to exist beyond the *pamphlet*.

† There is a *certain* merriment, which the wise writer of Ecclesiastes has compared to "the crackling of thorns." It is for the CALM INQUIRER to consider, whether his laughter be of *this* description.—Could it have been imagined, that the Unitarians would have put forward, the dullest of their tribe, in their vindication? Yet so it is. Here we have, not only an utter incapacity to understand a plain argument, but a merry making in the display of dulness, which, though ludicrous enough to lead the mind from the *speaking of the ox*, its favourite topic in this place, to the braying of an inferior animal, yet, when properly considered, can only move compassion. The severities of this writer, also, are of the same family with his jocularities. The author of the Discourses on Atonement and Sacrifice, must, surely, feel himself deeply wounded, by being reminded, as he is in every second page of this performance, that he is a "DUBLIN PROFESSOR," an "IRISH THEOLOGIAN;" and, of course, debarred from breathing that purer intellectual atmosphere, which has been the happier lot, and readily accounts for the higher endowments, of the CALM INQUIRER, and his associates. *Whatever* neatness of invective there may be in this, is accompanied with a *like* delicacy of insinuation, equally indicative of the

the expense of the *Dublin Professor*; who would, he says, on *his* principles, be “unable to believe the battle of Cannæ, without believing likewise that

refinement of the writer. “*Silly conclusions*,” “*silly observations*,” and “*nonsense*,” are some of those remote and gently touched forms of expression, which enable the writer to make a deep incision, whilst he scarcely seems to intend a wound. See pp. 7. 8. 9. 10. 12. 13. 17. 18. 19. 24. of the Address, &c. The Author, indeed, we find, deals in such daintily enfolded satire as the above, not less from policy than from taste. For he openly expresses himself, as habitually aware, that “coarse and vulgar language is no advantage to any cause:” and he adds, that “UNITARIANS *disdain* to descend to it: and that if their principles cannot stand without it, they are content that they should fall.” (p. 5.) It is to be presumed, that the highly classical, and liberal, forms of education, and habits of Society, in which *Unitarians* are generally trained up in their Academies, have produced this elevation and urbanity, which the author claims for his brethren; and which are so abundantly displayed in their writings, even where it might be supposed, that the literæ humaniores would have given way, before the ardour of controversy.

Thus Mr. Belsham, who is eminent in this line, beautifully describes, in his Letters to the Rev. H. Horsley, the “temerity” of that gentleman, by his “running a muck at all he meets.” (Monthly Repository, vol. viii. p. 454.) With like elegance, he represents Bishop Horsley, (*ibid.* p. 176.) as possessing “a bow-wow manner:” and (p. 244.) denominates any person, “who should seriously profess to believe,” that the Bishop had the advantage in the argument with Dr. Priestley, “A SOLEMN IGNORAMUS.” This last, indeed Mr. Belsham conceives to be a peculiarly happy flight. He returns to it, after an interval of two years; as may be seen in the Gentleman’s Magazine, vol. viii. N. S. p. 322; in which, although, from his benevolence, he is *harrassed with fears*, lest this potent phrase should “disturb the rest and haunt the dreams” of the learned successor of Dr. Horsley; yet, from his good taste, and self-complacency, as the author of so singularly pointed and beautiful an expression, he *exults* in the thought, that “*this goading remark*” “*clings to his Lordship’s soul*,” and that “*this BUSINESS OF THE ‘SOLEMN IGNORAMUS’ twines about his heart-strings*,” so that “*he cannot get over it*,”—&c. The numberless finely turned compliments, which this writer has paid, on many occasions, to the *Clergy of the Established Church*, are instances of

the ox spoke:" but, at the same time, he comforts himself with the reflection, that *he* lives on *that* "side of the water," in which, "a little common

the same delicate description. These exercises of refined taste, indeed, this author luxuriates in, to such a degree, that they are to be found almost in every page of his writings. A few other specimens have been already adduced at pp. 159—160. 163. Nor are these flowers of fragrant rhetoric reserved for persons:—they are sometimes made to spread their perfume over things.

Thus, in his answer to the Bishop of St. David's Brief Memorial, in speaking of 1 John, v. 7. he says, (p. 179.) "the *notorious* text of the heavenly witnesses, has been so long dead and buried, that '*by this time it stinketh*:'" nor will all the labour and learning of the *pious* prelate, even though it should be aided by all the professional skill and experience of the *Humane Society*, ever be able to bring it back to life." Some have thought, that the gravity of scripture language gives a seasoning to wit. It will be remembered, that the reference, here, is to the raising of Lazarus to life by our BLESSED SAVIOUR. And the *joke* consists in an allusion to *this action of our Lord*; whilst a diverting picture is held up of the Prelate, at the head of the whole Humane Society, labouring in vain to restore a dead text to life: and the *piety* of the *well intending* Bishop is made to bestow an additional pleasantry upon the whole.

Mr. Belsham, Mr. Gilchrist, and other such polished writers of the Unitarian school, have quite a felicity in this way. Does not the latter gentleman, however, *affect*, occasionally, to depart *somewhat* from these delicacies, when he says, that in reasoning with the Trinitarian, he "feels as if he were brought upon the stage, to fight with wild beasts, or to contend with madmen:" and again, that, as to the argument drawn from Christ's being the *only begotten Son of God*,—"the man, who, in the nineteenth century, can say, that Deity has generated Deity, is fitter to be driven to the fold, or locked up in a mad house, than reasoned with:" and again, when he speaks of "mongrels and monsters," as descriptive of the *trinity*, and the *two-fold nature of Christ*: and when he exclaims against the "mystical monks and feeble-minded narrow souled priests," who hold those doctrines? And, does he not offer some degree of violence, to the delicacy, and taste, which his habits of association must have produced, when he pretends to say, "*We* prefer 'clearness and aptness to neatness and politeness, and fetch comparisons from the stable or the scullery when none occur suitable to our purpose in the parlour or the drawing

sense is exercised in judging of a report, and in discriminating what is worthy of belief from what

room:" and when he professes to exult, "that when our immortal authors wrote," (such as Shakspeare, Bacon, Taylor and Barrow,") "*such a thing as taste, and its principles, laws, and rules, (which are ever found to flourish most in barren ground,) were not even heard of: a century or two after, come creeping into existence a feeble finical race of dancing masters and epicures, mawkishly puling about taste, as if they had no receptacle but their stomach, and no standard of excellence but their palate.*"—Surely, this polished writer has permitted his *early* acquaintance with Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Longinus, and the other great masters of antiquity, to carry him to a degree of fastidiousness, somewhat too severe, against Rhetoricians of later times.—N. B. This gentleman is one of the *chosen* champions of Unitarianism, *appointed to preach on stated days and subjects (publicly advertised)* at the Unitarian meeting house in Finsbury Square. The finished composition, from which I have given these few specimens of his happiest manner, is a Discourse delivered by this Unitarian preacher at Southampton in 1814. But I must not allow this attractive subject to detain me too long. I cannot, however, forbear adding, for the information of all those interested in the progress of just composition as well as of etymological research, that I learn from a sketch fresh from the press, which has just now met my eye, that this vigorous and elegant writer intends to devote his *uncommon* powers to the promotion of these objects. He professes himself altogether disgusted with Mr. Dugald Stewart, as "a finical rhetorician, a quibbling metaphysician"—who "is as ignorant of words as of notions, and of notions as of words"—and as purblind in metaphysics as in phylogogy." And he declares his grand object in engaging in etymological studies to be, that they may produce an "effect on such misty, vacuous compositions as those of Professor Stewart, similar to that of electric concussions on stagnant vapours. The horizon of language being completely cleared from the fogs of such writers as Professor Stewart, we are then to have, by the bright reflection of "words," which this gentleman says are the "mirrors of ideas," such luminous views of all that relates to the science and metaphysics of language, as will give us the full benefit of an unclouded meridian sun. Thus we see, that from the splendid orb of Unitarianism, floods of light are now to break in upon us in all directions. From the united efforts of these two great Metaphysicians and finished writers of the Unitarian School.

appears to be incredible in the works of the same author.”* (Address, &c. pp. 8. 9.)

Most assuredly, if such reasoning were supposed

Mr. Belsham and Mr. Gilchrist, it is plain, that Professor Stewart cannot be expected any longer to stand his ground.—That he should have been made a special object by these Unitarian metaphysicians and rhetoricians is not surprising, when it is considered, that his writings possess properties in every respect the direct opposite of what belong to theirs; and, in addition to this, when Mr. Gilchrist has discovered him to be a “BIGOTED PERSECUTOR.” Now that Mr. Stewart has been thus convicted as a pitiful composer, an ignorant metaphysician and a *bigoted persecutor*, it is time that real masters, like Mr. Gilchrist and Mr. Belsham should take his place. The reader will receive some amusement from a paper on PHILOSOPHICAL ETYMOLOGY in the Monthly Magazine of Feb. 1, of this year.

* Mr. Wardlaw, who treats whatever he handles, with singular clearness and good sense, observes, on this passage, coupled with the distinction, just before quoted from this writer, respecting what is credible and incredible in Livy,—“Very well. We have no objection to his saying, provided he does not insist that *our* faith shall be regulated by *his* ‘The Evangelist Matthew relates, that Jesus of Nazareth died on a cross; and I believe him. The same Evangelist Matthew relates, that Jesus of Nazareth was born of a virgin; but I believe him not.’—Let this writer, by all means, ‘exercise a little common sense in judging of a report, and in discriminating’—(&c. as above quoted.) But let him not, wherever he finds any thing which *he* may be pleased to deem incredible, unwarrantably and presumptuously conclude that *it forms no part of what the author wrote.*” (Discourses, &c. p. 433.) The same sensible and serious author properly remarks, upon “the levity, and impiety, of the comparison” devised by the CALM INQUIRER.—That the *speaking of the ox* has been chosen as a parallel to the history of our *Lord’s Incarnation*, is, undoubtedly, in perfect correspondence with the degree of respect, which this writer shews, throughout, for sacred subjects. His choice of this subject of allusion might lead one to suppose, that from the same pen, had lately issued, another production upon the credibility of the *Incarnation*, in which the ox is likewise made an object of comparison and a topic of illustration. Shocking as is the subject matter of this publication, yet, for reasons sufficiently obvious, I shall here give a sketch of its general outline, suppressing however the most disgusting particulars. The writer, having described the

to be characteristic, of the side of the water, to which this Calm Inquirer belongs, neither will be very ambitious to claim him as its property. The

worship of the golden calf at Horeb, as an act of blasphemous idolatry, and having supposed the Israelites to have passed, from this species of worship, to that of the fabulous God Apis, under the idea, that the God of Israel had, in the womb of a cow, taken upon him the bovine nature, and thus become incarnate, in the form of an ox, whilst at the same time still in heaven,—he asks, whether this worship would not have been at least as blasphemous as the other. And, if so, he contends, it must be equally blasphemous, to admit the doctrine of the Incarnation, as contained in the N. T. since the nature of the animal, through which the Divine Being became Incarnate, can make no difference whatever. He then demands, whether, if it shall appear, that the Emperor Constantine, and almost all who have succeeded him in the possession of civil power in Europe, have *abused their temporal authority, to the purpose of enforcing upon their subjects, the doctrine of such an incarnation of the Deity*, we shall not be forced to confess, that they have indeed “opened their mouths in BLASPHEMY against God.” In this strain, the writer continues, at considerable length, to revile, and brand with the charge of *blasphemy*, all who receive the scripture doctrine of the *Incarnation*. This publication, let it be observed, followed close upon the repeal of the *Law against Blasphemy*; and may be considered as some of the *first fruits* of that *Repeal*. Thus we see, the tables are now completely turned. The *Government* is now charged with that *blasphemy*, which it has ceased to denounce. And thus, whilst an *ideal* restraint upon liberty has been removed; a restraint, which operated, simply, to prevent such outrages as this upon decency, and, as it might ultimately prove, upon the essential peace and well being of the community; a license has been given to vilify the religion of the land, to bring its governing authorities into disrepute, and to give confidence and audacity to those turbulent spirits, who, through the downfall of religion, would work the destruction of the state. This is not the only instance, in which this license has been similarly exercised.—But to return.—The *bovine* allusion is, here, we find, and on a corresponding subject, as familiar as it is to the CALM INQUIRER. So that we might be tempted to pronounce the anonymous writer in both cases to be the same, did we not find the signature *B.* annexed to the publication in question; which signature, (although Mr. Wardlaw and Dr. Nares pronounce it to be

Homeric contest must here be but little to be apprehended. For in the same compass of *reasoning*, so rich a complication of blundering has seldom been concentrated. The two cases, confounded together as similar, are, manifestly, at direct variance, in *every* point of comparison. The testimony of the Ebionites relates 1. to *one* fact; the faithfulness of the transcript of a certain written record: 2. it is assumed to speak of this transcript from actual knowledge: and 3. it pronounces upon the whole of the transcript with equal positiveness throughout.—The testimony of the Historian, on the contrary, relates, 1. to *two* facts, distinct and unconnected: 2. it refers but to the reports of these facts derived from others: and 3. it speaks of these facts in terms widely different, as to the credit attached to them by the Historian. Yet, the advocate of the Unitarians sees these two cases so completely identified, that, if Livy's report of the one fact can reasonably be deemed credible, whilst his report of the other is considered to be incredible, it follows, he thinks, of necessary consequence, that the Ebionites may, at the same time, be received as credible, and rejected as incredible, respecting different parts of the transcript, the fidelity of the whole of which they attest.

But the grand parent blunder of all, consists in the confounding the *genuineness of the record* with the *truth of the facts* recorded. If, indeed, this Calm Inquirer had, in this happy comparison between Livy and the Ebionites, pronounced, that, as he could not believe that the *ox spoke*, therefore the

the *initial* of the person who has assumed the title of the CALM INQUIRER, and although a writer, of this initial, does assume this title familiarly in almost all his publications, see particularly his Claims of Dr. Priestley,—yet) we have no right to affirm, *must* belong to the CALM INQUIRER.

part of Livy's history, which contained the report of that fact, could not be genuine, he would then have said something which bore upon the question: or, if, instead of relating the two facts of the *battle of Cannæ* and the *speaking of the ox*, Livy had professed to have given both these relations, as a transcript from Fabius Pictor, or some other ancient historian, and that it could be proved with respect to the latter of the two, that he had falsified as to its being a part of the ancient document, whilst it remained to be inferred from his authority, whether the former were contained in it or not: our critic would, indeed, have a case parallel to the one in question, whatever might be the fruits of the similitude: but, by an extraordinary confusion of brain, (instanced very frequently in writings, bearing the same signature with this Unitarian pamphlet,) matters, totally dissonant, are blended together as one: and as in the example of the blind man reasoning upon objects of sight, the nature of scarlet colour is deduced from the sound of a trumpet.

However, had this writer been able to arrive at his own meaning, he would have found it to be this, which may be discovered moving in a confused and muddy stream through all that he has said:—that the reason, why, he and the Editors believe the Ebionites, when they reject that part of the first two chapters of St. Matthew, which contains the account of the miraculous conception, and do not believe them, when they reject the part, which contains the genealogy, is, that they cannot admit the story of the miraculous conception, which wars with their system, to be credible; whilst the account of the genealogy, which they conceive to accord with that system, they have no objection to believe. That is, in truth, they determine what is genuine in Scripture, and what is not, by its ac-

cordance and repugnance to their system; whilst they profess to derive their system, from what is genuine in Scripture. This is the true logic of Hackney:* a happy specimen of the circulating

* For a complete system of the Logic of Hackney, combined with a treatise of metaphysics, worthy of sharing the same fortunes under the same cover, the reader may recollect that I have already referred him, at p. 178, of this volume, to a work entitled *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind*, &c. a work, possessing nothing but the name in common with the production of an elegant and acute Metaphysician now living. Why the Socinian of Hackney should have chosen this title, already appropriated, it is hard to say. It could not be to *mark* contrast. Could it be to filch a credit from homonymous association? But, be it as it may in this respect, it contains a Logic, and a Metaphysic, for the use of Unitarians, which is worthy of no other cause. Many specimens of their application have been exhibited in these sheets; and especially, at p. 178—181, of this volume, some of the actual contents have been drawn out, for the edification of the reader. A late publication, by the author of the *Elements*, in which he adverts to that work, induces me to direct the reader's attention to it once more.

In his *Claims of Dr. Priestley*, p. 11, he quotes the following passage from the Rev. H. Horsley—"I have been told, by a learned friend of mine, much conversant in works on the laws of reasoning, that Mr. B. published, some years ago, a *Compendium of Logic*, remarkable for such *definitions* as the world had never before seen." [Some *definitions*, to which such a character would fairly apply, the reader has seen at the pages which I have above referred to.] Now, what is Mr. Belsham's observation, in answer to this?—"It should seem, that the reverend Prebendary's *learned friend* was not very deeply conversant with the works of Locke, *from which the DOCTRINE of definition in the Compendium is taken.*"—Now, is it too much to say, that the author, who gave such an answer, is incapable of framing a *definition*, if *precision* be of its essence? What has the Rev. Prebendary said?—That Mr. B.'s *Compendium* contained *definitions* of an extraordinary nature. No such thing, says Mr. B. for my *doctrine* of definition, (of which the learned Prebendary had said not one word,) is taken from Locke.—*Ex pede Herculem.* The reader may easily judge of the *Compendium*, and of its *definitions*.

But, to mend the matter—taking up even this *DOCTRINE of definition*, which Mr. B. deems his palladium, so far is it from

sylogism, with which the writings of Unitarians abound. Part of these chapters is not genuine, be-

being taken from Locke, that Mr. Locke, were he alive, would not acknowledge *one sentence of it* from the beginning to the end. And, what is whimsical enough, in the unfolding this very *doctrine of definition*, (which is, in truth, but a caricature of *any* intelligible doctrine upon the subject,) this writer has indulged, (by way of example of what *definition* ought to be,) in some *definitions*, of that very description to which the Rev. Prebendary had alluded.—Will the reader believe, that his definition of “*creature*,” combined with that of “*substance*,” represents the former to be, “DERIVED BEING SELF-SUBSISTING :” and that his definition of a *square* is, “a FOUR sided figure, having FOUR equal sides, and FOUR right angles ?” The *species of Being*, to which “*creature*” is synonymous, is here, undoubtedly, *more fully* opened up, than by any other writer. And the *fact* of the *four-sided* figure called a *square*, having actually FOUR sides and FOUR angles, is better enforced from the repetition, than in the meagre definition given of it by Euclid ; which merely pronounces, of this species of *four-sided figure*, that it “has its *sides equal* and its *angles right* :”—ισοπλευρον τε εστι και ορθογωνιον. How the richness and amplification of the modern English Mathematician shine forth, when contrasted with the parsimony of the superannuated Greek ! Some indeed may affect to complain that the Laws of Definition, (which, by the bye, the author forgot to notice in this complete *doctrine of definition taken from Locke*,) have not been here, very minutely observed : and that the *first* of these two definitions would have been *somewhat* improved by attending to *one* of those laws, (Definitio debet esse clara,) and the *second* by attending to the *other*, (Definitio debet esse adæquata.) But the author answers all such cavils, by saying, that his definitions cannot be wrong, because he has taken the *doctrine of definition* from Locke, (whom, in truth, he has not despoiled of an atom of his property on that subject,)—and I answer, that the reader need not quarrel with him for *such trifles*. Let him but read the chapter itself : and then——. For my own part, I view these Elements, altogether, as a truly wonderful performance. I never return to them, but with fresh admiration. When to these Elements of Mr. Belsham, the philological lucubrations of his brother Unitarian, and congenial fellow-labourer, Mr. Gilchrist, have been superadded, then, indeed, the human understanding will have received such aid, that, not only the Logics and Metaphysics of Mr. Dugald Stewart, and other moderns may be safely dismissed, but the *Novum Organum* itself, (it is to be supposed,) will be superseded.

cause its contents are not credible, and the contents of that part are not credible, because it is not genuine.* To be called upon to establish either the

* Of the *Hackney Logic*, there is another excellent specimen connected with this subject. It is one, which opens with the first exercise of the critical powers of the Editors, and even with the first line of their first note in the Imp. Version. It is neither more nor less, than their *concluding in necessary matter*, from a probable *premiss*. It is probable, they say, that the genealogy is genuine, and was found in the copies of Cerinthus and Carpocrates. But the story of the miraculous conception *could not* (they add) have been written by the author of the genealogy. *Therefore*, they conclude, the story of the miraculous conception *must have been wanting* in the copies above named: for if the genealogy be genuine, the story must be spurious. Thus we see, that, because the genealogy *probably* is genuine, the story of the miraculous conception *necessarily* is spurious!! and upon REASONING (am I to call it?) such as this, an important portion of Scripture, supported by every existing manuscript and version, is at once swept away. Let Unitarians, who have been weak enough to take these Editors, as the guides of their belief in what is true scripture, see, on what intellects they build their faith: and let them recollect, what true scripture has pronounced to be, not the *probable*, but *certain*, issue, where *the blind lead the blind*.

But independently of this jump from the PROBABLE to the NECESSARY, we have a slight difference with these Dialecticians, upon the matter of the *vis consequentiæ* also; which they assume a little too hastily; and which a word or two will be sufficient to rescue from their grasp. "If the genealogy be genuine, this narrative" (viz. of the miraculous conception) *MUST BE spurious*."—Why so? Because *this narrative* "COULD NOT have been written by the author of the *genealogy*: for it *contradicts his design*, which was to prove, that Jesus, being the son of Joseph, was the descendant of Abraham and David; whereas the design of this narrative is to show that Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus, was not his real father." The same argument is repeated by the Calm Inquirer, (p. 12. of the Address, &c.) in his defence of the Editors. Now, both the Editors, and their vindicator, may be perfectly at ease, as to the difficulty, which the author of the genealogy would have to combat, in reciting the narrative of the miraculous conception: for if, as they inform us, this difficulty was to be occasioned, only by the circumstance, of the *design of the narrative* being to shew

spuriousness of the record, or the falsehood of the contents *separately*, is deemed to be unreasonable and captious.

that Joseph was *not* the *real* father of Jesus, this could raise no very great impediment, in the way of him, who asserts *this very thing* in his account of the genealogy. For what does the *genealogy* say? "Abraham *begat* Isaac," "Isaac *begat* Jacob,"—and so on, for about forty generations, using the word γεννησε, *begat*, in each instance; until, in the 16th verse, the whole closes, with telling us, that "Jacob *begat* Joseph:" and what next?—that Joseph *begat* Jesus? No; no such thing. The uniform course is here at once broken:—"Jacob *begat* Joseph, the husband of Mary: OF WHOM" (Mary) "WAS BORN Jesus, who is called Christ."—Ιακωβ δὲ γεννησε τον Ιωσηφ, τον ανδρα μαριας; ΕΞ ΗΣ γεννηθη Ιησους ο λεγομενος χριστος. Now, could it be possible, in plainer terms, to declare, that though Jesus was born of Mary, who was married to Joseph, yet that Joseph *did not beget* him? [See particularly Rosenmuller on Matt. i. 17. page 16.] And is not this precisely what the *narrative of the miraculous conception*, in the same Evangelist, relates at length? We see, then, that a part of the "design of the genealogy," is precisely that, which, the Editors say, was "the design of the narrative;" namely, to show that, Joseph the *reputed* father of Jesus was not his *real* father."—And in like manner, we are told this exactly, in St. Luke's reference to the same subject: that Evangelist, when he speaks of Jesus, as the son of Joseph, using these remarkable words, "being, AS WAS SUPPOSED, the son of Joseph:" i. e. being his *reputed* son only, but *not* his son in reality. [N. B. the attempt of the Editors to get rid of this, by construing ως νομιζεται, "as was allowed by law," is quite pitiable. Even if the translation could be justified, it would still be an admission, that he was but the *reputed* son, *allowed as such* by the law.] "Josephi filius NON ERAT, sed VULGO PUTABATUR"—"He was NOT the son of Joseph, but only VULGARLY REPUTED TO BE SO,"—are the words of Grotius, in explaining this part of St. Luke. This favourite author the Editors had quoted on the words immediately preceding ως νομιζεται, but thought it not convenient to travel forward the next step, and quote him upon these. Another favourite author, they have also declined quoting, on the subject of the genealogy as given in Matthew; namely, Lardner, who affirms of the Cerinthians, that, "if they received the genealogy in Matthew," they "*must allow* that Jesus was born of a virgin." (Works, vol. ix. p. 326.) This, it will be remembered, is the opinion of a decided Unitarian. Again, what is to be said

The same course is pursued with respect to Marcion, as with regard to the Ebionites. The Calm Inquirer contends for the right of the Editors, to believe and to disbelieve, of what *he* attests, just what they may choose, pronouncing him credi-

of their greatest favourites of all, the Ebionites? Is it to be supposed, that they would have *cut out* the genealogy, from the very gospel which they used, (which is what the Editors affirm of them,) if the design of the genealogy included that which the Ebionites were most anxious to establish: namely, the proof, that Joseph was the real father of Jesus? May we not rather suspect, that they found the genealogy so unfavourable to this result, that they thought it prudent to expunge it from their gospel?

To sum up now the substance of this note.—The Editors, and their Calm Inquirer, have said: It is *probable* that the genealogy is genuine; *therefore* the narrative of the miraculous conception which contradicts its design *must* be spurious. I answer. The *probability* of the former could not induce the *necessity* of the latter, even *if* there were a contradiction. But there being, in place of a contradiction, a marked *conformity*, between the *genealogy* and the *narrative*, the genuineness of either tends to *confirm* that of the other.—Thus then, we see, Scripture is swept away not merely for reasons not sufficient, but for reasons that should establish it.

That I might not encumber the subject, I made mention, at the beginning of this note, of but *one* probability. But, in reality, the Editors have grounded their argument upon two, the one engrafted upon the other. The gospel of the Ebionites, they say, was *probably* the original gospel of Matthew written in the Hebrew for the Jewish believers. This is *one probability* (or rather an aggregate of probabilities.) Then, again, it is *probable*, that this original gospel, &c. contained the genealogy. This is a *second probability* raised upon the shoulders of the former: or rather they should have been reversed, and the other raised upon the shoulders of this. But it is the same in the end. From one hypothesis built upon another; from a probability growing upon a probability; a *certainty* is the result.—This translated into mathematical language, would make the product of two proper fractions (which must be a smaller fraction than either,) equal to an integer;—a mathematical result, equally worthy of Hackney *with* the logical one, that would make the *chance of a chance* amount to CERTAINTY.

ble and incredible at pleasure : and, with the conduct of the Dublin Professor, who is so unreasonable, as to contend, that this Marcion should *either* be considered as a credible witness, *or* as one not credible, but not *both* at the same time, he contrasts his own great candour and that of the Unitarians ; who, he says, would actually believe Athanasius himself, “the great Athanasius,” IF he bore *testimony in favour of the Unitarian side of the question*. (This is* candour.) He, then proceeds, in full triumph, to condemn, as before, the Dublin Professor for “applying his *new* principle of believe *all* or *none* to the testimony of Marcion ;” or, as he otherwise expresses it, for “not being content, unless all be believed in the *lump* ;” unless people “believe or disbelieve in the *gross*.” And he concludes the subject, in the same spirit of candour and good sense which had governed him throughout, by remarking, that this is “a very convenient faith, to those, who are to *gulp* down the bitter portion of thirty-nine articles, *before they can lay hold of the golden prize which glitters before them*.” These are the words of the Calm Inquirer.† Address, &c. p. 11.

* This *candour* must also carry the writer so far, as to induce him, even though it were acknowledged, that Athanasius had mutilated any writing, to admit the testimony of that Father to its completeness. If it does not carry him so far, it will answer no purpose on the present occasion. This however is a degree of candour, in which, although it cannot be supposed, that I have any indisposition towards Athanasius, I certainly should not be able to imitate this CALM INQUIRER.

† This really sounds so very like the language which we are accustomed to hear from *another* CALM INQUIRER, in his *habitual revilings* of the Clergy of the Established Church, that one might be almost tempted, notwithstanding the miserable stupidity of this anonymous writer, to imagine both CALM INQUIRERS to be the same. However, be it known to *this* CALM INQUIRER, whoever he may be, that even the one or two articles,

Thus we see, how victoriously, this Unitarian champion winds up his argument. And yet, so great is the force of prejudice, opposed to all this

which comprise the Hackney or Essex street faith, would be found by any honest, pious and intelligent *Christian*, a more difficult swallow, than, not merely the *thirty-nine*, but five hundred articles, conceived in the same spirit with them, and governed by the same adherence to Scripture: and for this plain reason: that whatever might tempt him to such a swallow, it *could not be* the love of truth, combined with knowledge. Be it known also, to this CALM INQUIRER, that, with respect to "the glittering prize," which, *in the honesty of his conscience he believes* to be the inducement, with the Clergy of the Establishment, to subscribe the Articles of their creed—the disinterested ministers of the classes, with which he associates, obtain, individually, much more of this, by their *dissent* from those Articles, than nine-tenths of the Established Clergy do by their *acquiescence*. It is well known, that viewing the matter as a mere question of gain—the light in which this writer's taste disposes him to consider it—the non-conformist teachers drive a more gainful trade, than the great majority of our Clergy; and a *much* more gainful one, than the *same* persons, generally, would have any chance of driving, had they abandoned the conventicle for the church: and this too, even admitting, that there were room for so many additional candidates for ecclesiastical emoluments.

Those, then, who, with the CALM INQUIRER, would make traffic of their ministry, have no just cause for the jealousy which he expresses. They really have no right to complain. They have not only more of actual gain, but, if the heads of the Church be excepted, they have, from the usual operation of party spirit, more of distinction, and individual sway, than the members of our Clergy at large. If, then, there be on their side, not only more of positive profit; but, if in addition to this, there be the indulgence of vanity, and the gratification of spleen—qualities, which, time out of mind, have belonged to the family of *dissent*—why should the CALM INQUIRER be disturbed from his *calmness*, by the contemplation of the advantages of the national clergy?

N. B. I have lately seen somewhere, a proposal for publishing the *lives* of English Unitarian teachers. And, some time back, we had a splendid account of a PORTRAIT to be taken of the Rev. Thomas Belsham, and an ENGRAVING also, by two of the most distinguished artists, in consideration of his exertions

powerful reasoning, sharpened, even as it is, by such keenness of wit, that, unless it can be made to appear a little more clearly, 1. that a witness's own declaration is decisive of his truth : or 2. that his deliberate mutilation of one part of a written document which he attests renders him more credible as to the remainder ; or 3. that he may be at the same time a credible and not a credible witness to the same point,—I must, after all, and, I apprehend, so will a great majority of my readers, continue under the impressions, (for the reasons already assigned, at pp. 198—202. 210—231. of this volume,) that the first two chapters of the Gospels

in editing the Improved Version of the New Testament. (See Monthly Rep. vol. iv. p. 119. by which we are informed, by the bye, who has been the Editor, or at least the principal Editor, of this extraordinary production.) Thus lives, portraits, biographical notices, literary puffings, and distinctions of all sorts are heaped upon persons, merely because they rank as the teachers of certain non-conformist classes ; whilst the parochial clergy of the Established Church, are left to their labours, and their obscurity.

In a calculation, such as that, which the CALM INQUIRER has forced upon us here, it is also fair to advert, to the previous institution for the clerical office ; both as a matter of qualification, and of expense. I cannot pronounce as to the usage in England, not being acquainted with it ; but I can positively assert, that, in this country, no person can be admitted into holy orders, without a preparatory occupation of ELEVEN YEARS at the least, (from the commencement of *classical* learning,) in the School and the University. I speak here of the established rules of ordination, requiring Collegiate testimonials, from which I do not know of any departure. What then the outfit is, even in point of expenditure, it is not difficult to judge.—The Unitarians, and most other classes of non-conformists can say, how the matter stands as to their *academies* and *systems of education*. In some cases, it is well known, the individual is his own University, confers his own degrees and orders ; and has little more difficulty in the way of his vocation, than to find a new hat, a stout pony, and a pair of saddle bags. Now, if the Calm Inquirer will have it to be a mere matter of lucre, where lies the best bargain ?

of Matthew and Luke are to be received as genuine Scripture, notwithstanding the alleged want of these chapters in the respective copies of the Ebionites and Marcion.

But, what shall we say, if the entire foundation of the argument, with which the Editors and their Calm Inquirer have been amusing us, be itself a *fiction*: and if it shall appear, not only, that the *Ebionite Gospel* was not a copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew, nor the *Marcionite Gospel* a copy of that of St. Luke, but that neither of them *professed* to be such? What, in this case, becomes of the *fact*, of the want of the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, or of any parts of these Gospels, in the books of these ancient heretics? Now, upon a full investigation of the testimonies of the Fathers, from whom alone we can derive information, as to what the books of these heretics actually contained, this case seems to be satisfactorily established. To enter into the proof, here, would occupy too much room. It is, fortunately, however, altogether unnecessary; as the subject has been already fully discussed; and the results of the above testimonies carefully ascertained, by the most competent judges, to whom reference can easily be had. To bring the matter within the smallest compass, I am satisfied to appeal to those very judges, whom the Unitarians pronounce to be the most to be relied upon on subjects such as this. To assist in determining on all points relating to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, the Editors inform us, in their introduction, (p. vii.) that “the learned Jeremiah Jones on the Canon, and Dr. Lardner’s laborious work upon the credibility of the Gospel History, contain the *most accurate and copious information*.” They might have referred to other distinguished authorities on the same subject, who

would have thrown much light on the present question. But, I am willing to abide by the decision of these arbiters, whom the Unitarians have themselves selected; and who, undoubtedly, are well entitled to the praise bestowed on them, for the industry and learning, which they have displayed, in their enquiries into the authenticity of the writings of the New Testament.—Now what is the report of these writers?

And first, as to the Ebionites, what says the learned Jeremiah Jones?" He tells us, that these Ebionites, (whom he pronounces to be "a most ridiculous set of heretics, who scarcely deserved the name of Christians," vol. ii. p. 270.) possessed a Hebrew gospel, which, he proves at length, to have been, "a spurious and apocryphal piece:" "not mentioned in any of the ancient catalogues:" "not cited by any of the ancient writers:" "not read in any of the assemblies of the primitive Christians:" "containing several things* contrary to certainly known and undoubted truths;" also

* Among the instances of this nature, which have been adduced, it may be sufficient to mention one, as illustrative of the degree of corruption, to which this Ebionite gospel had been carried.—"The mother and brethren of Christ spake to him and said; John the Baptist baptizes for the remission of sins, let us go and be baptized by him: He said to them, In what have I sinned, that I have need to go to be baptized by him, unless my saying this proceeds from ignorance?" And, after thus describing our Lord's *unwillingness* to submit to John's Baptism, this gospel goes on to put into our Lord's mouth reasons for *denying baptism to John, who had fallen down before our Lord to entreat it of him.* Other instances of such strange fabrication will be found in Jones, vol. i. pp. 376—379. 541. See also Lardner's Works, vol. ii. pp. 127. 128. Mill. Proleg. pp. 6. 31. 32. Grot. (Crit. Sac. vol. vi. pp. 40. 572.)—Voss. Dissert. de Gen. Jes. Chr. pp. 16. 17. Ittig. de Hæresiarch. p. 76—82. Mich. Introd. vol. iii. p. 176—180. Dr. Laurence's Crit. Refl. p. 34—37. 44. 45.

“things trifling and silly;” * “things later than the time in which it pretends to have been written:” and that, so far from professing to be a copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew, it, though principally compiled from that Gospel, “pretended to be made by the Twelve Apostles.” (New and Full Method, &c. vol. i. pp. 219—223. 272. 330—387.

Again, what says Dr. Lardner? Substantially the same things, that Jeremiah Jones has said: admitting both the fact of the compilation, and the introduction of foreign and spurious matter. “The Gospel, according to the Hebrews,” by which he understands the Gospel used by the Ebionites, this writer pronounces to have been a compilation later in time than “our genuine gospels; having indeed, as its *ground work*, St. Matthew’s Gospel,” but with “*additions of things taken out of St. Luke’s, (and perhaps other Gospels,) and other matters that had been delivered by oral tradition.*” (Works, vol. ii. p. 84.) He has gone very fully into this subject of the Gospel used by the Ebionites, as well as their opinions, and their fabrication of Apocryphal writings, in various other parts of his works.—See vol. ii. pp. 127. 143. 358. vii. p. 19—24. ix. pp. 255. 322. 329.

Thus, then, after the most ample and accurate examination of the various accounts of the Ebionites and their Gospel, transmitted to us by the ancient Fathers, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, &c. the result which we arrive at, through the laborious researches of Jones and Lardner, is, that the Gospel in question was no more than a

* Such as our Lord’s saying, that “his mother, the Holy Ghost, laid hold of him by one of his hairs, and carried him into the great mountain Thabor,” &c. &c. For similar instances, see Jones, vol. i. p. 379. also the Authors referred to in the preceding note.

compilation from the genuine gospels, founded upon Matthew as its principal ground work, and including matter not contained in any part of canonical scripture: in other words, a garbled selection from the Gospels, with spurious additions: so that it neither was nor pretended to be a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, however it might have been framed upon that Gospel as its foundation. The same result has been abundantly established by numerous* other

* Grotius, whose authority Unitarians so much affect to value, concurs in the general charges of corruption against the Ebionite Gospel, (Crit. Sacr. vol. vi. pp. 40. 41. 572.) but conceives the groundwork to be the gospel of St. Matthew, *mutilated* by the Ebionites to accommodate it to their peculiar opinions.—Casaubon (adv. Baron. Annal. exerc. xvi. pp. 279. 485.) pronounces this Gospel, so far from being an authentic copy of St. Matthew, to have been a *Work full of fables and corruptions of every sort*.—Dr. Grabe (Spicil. Patr. vol. i. p. 15, &c.) goes so far as to affirm, that it was not even formed on the groundwork of Matthew's Gospel, but a distinct work altogether, composed by the Jewish converts, and afterwards spoken of erroneously under the title of Matthew's Gospel. Mill (in his Proleg. pp. 31. 32.) contends for the idea of a *mutilated* copy of St. Matthew having formed the groundwork; and that upon this was superinduced matter from the other gospels, so as to compose a *διασκευαστον*, but a corrupted one.—Vossius (Diss. de Gen. Jes. Chr. p. 15—18.) describes this gospel as a *mutilated* and *interpolated* copy of a gospel, formed on the groundwork of St. Matthew by the Nazarenes.—Dr. Mangey, in his Remarks upon the Nazarenes of Toland, [who preceded the Unitarians, in the use attempted to be made, of this fictitious Ebionite copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, but whose inconsistencies upon the subject, great as they were, Mr. Wilson has shown in his illustrations, p. 274—305, to be much less extravagant than those of Dr. Priestley and his followers;] contends, that this gospel, so far from being a copy of St. Matthew's, was altogether a *chimerical* and *forged* production, (chap. vi. p. 35. chap. viii. pp. 58, 59.)—Dr. Whitby's conclusion concerning this Gospel is, that "it was not a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, free from additions and interpolations," but a translation of the Greek Gospel of Matthew into Hebrew, "with the same liberty of making *additions* to it from *tradition*, which we find in the Chaldee paraphrast: which version the primitive Christians among the

writers of distinguished note; but I have been desirous to present here, unmixed with any other, the decisions of Jones and Lardner, as being the favour-

Gentiles, who were ignorant of that language, finding in their hands,—might think an original written for their use.” (Pref. Disc. to the Gospels, pp. xlvi. xlvii.)—Michaelis (Introd. vol. iii. p. 174—180.) having adduced numerous instances of gross fabrication, ascribed to the Gospel of the Ebionites, concludes with saying, that it appears from those instances, that this “was not the original gospel of St. Matthew; but, on the contrary, that it was a composition put together, partly from St. Matthew’s, and partly from the other Gospels:” at pp. 179. 180. particularly, he adduces examples of selections from other Gospels besides that of Matthew; and, at p. 176. he observes, that there is reason to “doubt, whether the Ebionites themselves ascribed to it the name of St. Matthew’s Gospel.” He might indeed have gone farther, and pronounced positively, that they did *not* ascribe to it that name; when, in the preceding page, he has noticed the declaration of Epiphanius, that the Ebionites “*themselves* called it the *Hebrew Gospel*;” and when he has shown, also, from Epiphanius’s declaration, that from the great *corruptions* and *mutilations* of this gospel, it could not with any colour of probability be considered as the gospel of St. Matthew. But still further, it appears from another part of Epiphanius, that this gospel actually claimed to be the production of the *twelve Apostles*. See Jer. Jones, vol. i. pp. 380. 381. And, that the names, which were attributed to this Gospel, by those to whom it belonged, were, the *Gospel according to the Apostles*, and the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, is manifest from the writings of the Fathers, although they themselves occasionally allude to it, as if it were supposed to be a copy of St. Matthew’s gospel. Why they have done so, may be easily explained, from their having generally conceived it to have been founded upon the groundwork of that gospel, and for a reason which shall be adverted to hereafter.

Were I now, after the judgments of so many learned critics, to hazard an opinion of my own upon this subject, I would say, that I conceive the Ebionite gospel to have been a mutilated and corrupted copy of that of the Nazarenes; which was itself formed by *additions* to the gospel of St. Matthew from the other gospels as well as from tradition: this gospel being of course later than our canonical gospels; and the Ebionite much later again than this; for, it is to be observed, we find no mention of an Ebionite Gospel until near the close of the

ite authorities chosen by the Unitarians themselves. —Having seen the true nature of “*this purest copy of the Gospel of Matthew;*” which was possessed by the *Ebionites*; “this Gospel which they would on no account presume either to enlarge or to curtail:” we may, now, proceed to the *equally* immaculate copy of Luke’s Gospel by Marcion.

As before, we shall here appeal, to the two selected judges, Jones and Lardner. And first, Jones tells us, that “the Gospel of Marcion was really no other than one of our present gospels, *wretchedly corrupted and altered* by that *silly heretic*.” He quotes Tertullian, also, as saying, that “Marcion

second century. This, as it appears to me, goes a great way to reconcile the apparent differences in the testimony of the Fathers. The Ebionite Gospel might thus be generally spoken of as the Nazarene Gospel, being but a modification of it, at a later period; and the Nazarene gospel might, in like manner, (and through it the Ebionite,) be described, in loose phrase, as the Hebrew gospel of St. Matthew: the difference between the Ebionite and the Nazarene copies might then justly be pointed out; and, whilst the former was described as a mutilated representation of St. Matthew’s gospel, (απο μερους, και εχιστα,) the latter might be spoken of as πληροστατον; that is, as Michaelis explains this word, as a *lectio plenior* which might contain *more* than the original text. See Michaelis, especially, at vol. iii. pp. 175. 176. ὑπερπληρες Le Clerc calls it.—Besides, Jerome’s report of the *two* descriptions of Ebionites, (one being probably the Nazarene,) would be thus sufficiently accounted for. In this view of the subject, I feel myself nearer to Vossius, Grotius, and Mill, (particularly the first,) than to any other of the writers whom I have here quoted. But whether this solution prove satisfactory or not, has nothing to do with the question now before us. That the Ebionite gospel cannot be considered, as a *true copy of St. Matthew’s Gospel*; and that it was not pretended to be such; and did not even assume the name;—is all that it is requisite at present to establish: and whether this *be* established, it is for the reader to judge. —On the Ebionites, their opinions, and the gospel used by them, Ittigius de Hæresiarchis deserves particularly to be referred to, in addition to the writers already named. See p. 59—83.

has *prefixed no Author's name* to his Gospel, as if he might not as justly have forged a title as have corrupted the whole book." The Gospel, which Marcion thus "changed and corrupted, was" (he adds,) "the Gospel of St. Luke:" the nature of these corruptions he collects from Irenæus, Tertullian and Epiphanius; and he charges Marcion not only with "*taking away* entirely the two first chapters of Luke and many other parts," but also with "*inserting* a great many things of his own; all designed for the propagating his silly principles." (vol. i. pp. 326, 327.)—What, again, is the report of Lardner?—That the Evangelium of Marcion "contained only one of the four Gospels, viz. that of St. Luke; and this, *mutilated and altered*, and even *interpolated* in a great variety of places:" that "he would not allow it to be called the Gospel of St. Luke:" that some of his followers considered it as written partly by Christ himself, and partly by the Apostle Paul: that "Marcion retrenched the first and second chapters entirely, and began his gospel at the first verse of the third chapter, and even read this different from our copies, viz.* *that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, God descended into Capernaum a city of Galilee.*" (See Lardner's Works, vol. ix. p. 394.) This writer then proceeds (through p. 394—402.) to exhibit numerous instances of the† *mutilations and corruptions* charged

* This sentence, if indeed it can be supposed to have been derived from St. Luke at all, may be considered as a corrupted combination, of part of the *first verse* of the *third chapter*, with part of the *thirty-first verse* of the *fourth chapter* of that gospel; at which last verse, this copy of Marcion, may of course, be considered to begin. See Mill. Proleg. pp. 34. 35.

† Of these *mutilations* noticed by Lardner, as in reference to the contents of St. Luke's Gospel, I here subjoin a list; that the reader may the better judge of the *consistency* of the respect,

against the Evangelium of Marcion; and concludes with saying, that “on an impartial review of the alterations” made by him, although some are trifling, yet “*many of them are undoubtedly designed per-*

which the Editors shew, for the authority of Marcion, as to his omissions of matter contained in that Gospel.

Chapp. i. ii. iii. 2.—iv. 31. part of viii. 19. part of x. 21. xi. part of 29, and all of 30, 31, 32, 49, 50, 51. xii. 6, 28. part of 30 and 32. xiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. part of 28 and all of 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35. xv. 10—32. xvii. part of 10 and 12, 13, and part of 14. xviii. 31, 32, 33. xix. 27—47. xx. 8—18. 37. 38. xxi. 18, 21, 22. xxii. 16, 35, 36, 37, 51. xxiii. 43. xxiv. 26, 27.—These it must be remembered, also, are only such omissions, as can be, at this day, verified, from the writings of the Fathers, especially Epiphanius. How much more, of what is contained in St. Luke, was not in this Evangelium of Marcion, it is impossible to pronounce: none of the Fathers having proposed to enumerate the differences; as Lœffler has properly remarked, with respect to Epiphanius especially, who might above all be conceived to have had this object in view: (see Comm. Theol. vol. i. p. 214.) But, besides these instances of matter omitted, we have many supplied to us by Lardner, of passages different from the corresponding ones in Luke’s Gospel, of matter also not contained in Luke, and of subjects placed in a different order, (vol. ix. p. 394—402.) The general account of this gospel in relation to St. Luke’s, as it has been given by an ancient father, may satisfy us, (if any thing more can be wanting,) how slight the resemblance was altogether between the two. Ο μὲν γὰρ χαρακτήρ τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν σημαίνει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ὡς δὲ ἡκρωτιστῆσται, μὴτε ἀρχὴν ἔχον, μὴτε μέση, μὴτε τέλος, &c. καὶ οὐ καθ’ ὅριμον πάλιν ἐπιμένει, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν, ὡς προεῖπον, παρακίπται, τὰ δὲ προστίθουσιν ἀνω κάτω, οὐκ ὁρθῶς ἐκδιζῶν, ἀλλ’ ἐξεραδιουμένης πάντα περινοστεύων. Epiph. Hæres. 42. page 311.

This is that *pure copy* of the Gospel of Luke, which, being “the only gospel which Marcion believed to be authentic,” he would, of course, (like the Ebionites with regard to Matthew’s Gospel,) “on no account presume either to enlarge or to curtail.” Yet the Editors of the I. V. have, it is to be observed, not followed this *purest copy*, of Luke, either in its omissions, or alterations; save only, in leaving out the first two chapters, and, even of these, they have retained the first four verses; thus every way discrediting their own unblemished model. There seems a treachery in their praise. They commend, but to desert. Witness Newcome, Griesbach, and now, even Marcion and the Ebionites.

versions, intended to countenance, or at least not directly contradict, those absurd principles, which he and his followers espoused.”—He, next, brings under review, the gross corruptions of Marcion’s Apostolicon, with which we have no immediate concern; and at page 448, pronounces, as a general result, of this heretic, that, of the scriptures at large, he *rejected whatever did not suit his purpose*. In another part of his works, this writer declares his opinion to be, that Marcion had made Luke’s Gospel the ground work of a compilation, omitting what he pleased of this Gospel, and taking from the others such things as suited his purpose; and that this was probably the reason, why his gospel bore the title of no author whatever. As for Marcion himself, he pronounces him to have been “the *most arbitrary, and most licentious* of all the ancient heretics, in his judgment concerning the scripture that should be received, and in his manner of treating such as were received by him: so that *his opinion can be no prejudice to the genuineness, or the notoriety of any of those books of the New Testament, which were received by the Catholics, and indeed by most heretics likewise* :” and having established this by abundant authority, he closes with the expression of Tertullian concerning this heretic, that he *used a knife and not a style*. (Works, vol. vi. p. 657—660.

Such are the sentiments of Jones and Lardner, respecting Marcion, and his *gospel*: that *very* Marcion, upon whose “LEARNING AND INTEGRITY” the Unitarian Editors rely in their adjustment of an important part of the canon of the N. T.: and *that very gospel*, upon the authority of which, they pronounce the first two chapters of St. Luke to be spurious, in opposition to every manuscript, every version and every ancient document, relating to the subject,

which is known to be in existence throughout the world!!!

Having, now, followed the Editors to that tribunal, to which they are most willing to appeal, it is unnecessary for me to refer them to the numerous other distinguished critics, who* concur with the

* On the subject of Marcion and his Gospel, there seems, now, indeed, to be scarcely more than one opinion, amongst all well informed writers, who have lately treated of it. From a more accurate examination of the ancient authorities relating to this gospel, (Irenæus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius,) it has become the general opinion, that it was not intended as a copy of St. Luke's Gospel, but as an Evangelium compiled by Marcion for his own purposes, from various sources, (the Gospel of Luke among others,) and opposed by him and his followers, to *all the four gospels*, which the Catholics held to be *canonical*. This is the decided opinion of Semler: (Proleg. in Ep. ad Gal. § 2, 3.) and of Griesbach. (Hist. Text. Græc. Epist. Paul. Spec. I. Sect. iii. § 8.) We have an essay also in Velth. Comm. Theol. (vol. i. p. 180—218.) in which this point is established, at length, by a full display of the *great dissimilitude* between the two gospels, and of the other circumstances which evince this Evangelium to have been but a *compilation*, without the slightest pretence to be a copy of St. Luke's Gospel. Why it came, under these circumstances, to have been spoken of *as* such, the learned writer also explains, from a principle held particularly by Irenæus, that from some of the *FOUR GOSPELS*, all others, that claimed the name, *must necessarily*, have been derived: from which principle, he observes, it followed, that instead of being described as separate gospels, they were considered as corruptions of that canonical gospel, to which they seemed most nearly to approach: and, that hence, as the Ebionites were charged with having used a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, but greatly adulterated, the same thing was urged against the Marcionites, with respect to the Gospel of St. Luke; whereas, neither the one class of heretics, nor the other, pretended to exhibit the gospels of these Evangelists. (ibid. p. 215.) Dr. Marsh also concurs with the writers already named, conceiving it probable, that Marcion used some *apocryphal* gospel, which had much in common with St. Luke. (Marsh's Mich. vol. iii. part 2. pp. 159, 160.) And Dr. Laurence, in the third chapter of his Critical Reflections, &c. has clearly and fully summed up the strong points of the case, coinciding in the same conclu-

learned writers just named, in pronouncing, that the gospel of Marcion cannot be considered as a copy of St. Luke's Gospel, nor as intended to be proposed as such. Yet there is, after all, *one* authority, which the Editors, (or *one* Editor at least, surely,) must deem of such paramount importance, that I cannot avoid calling it to my aid, even though it be *ex abundanti*,) upon the present subject. This authority is no other than that of Mr. Thomas Belsham, who, in his *Answer to the Bishop of St. David's Brief Memorial*, has favoured the public with a lengthened view of the true state of the case, respecting Marcion; informing us of that, with which, all persons conversant with ecclesiastical history were already familiar; but which, being a recent discovery with Mr. Belsham, is naturally dwelt upon, with all the interest, which novelty excites. This writer informs us, (I give the substance for the sake of brevity,) that one of the apocryphal narratives which were in circulation before the Canon was formed, was selected by Marcion, under the bias, no doubt, of a prejudice in favour of his own system: and that, in this, he probably added or omitted upon the authority of other copies, what he thought would render it more perfect; and "thus formed what he called an *Evangelium*, or an epitome of the Evangelical history." This Mr. Belsham thinks the more probable, because "MARCION DOES NOT ATTRIBUTE HIS COPY TO ANY PARTICULAR AUTHOR." The history, of which Marcion made the principal use, our critic collects to be, that of Luke;

sion. [Indeed both the 2d and 3d chapters of this work of Dr. Laurence, deserve to be *particularly* attended to, by all, who would wish to see a full exposure of the absurd attempts of the Unitarian Editors to set up the idle story of Ebionite and Marcionite COPIES of Matthew and Luke, against the genuine gospels of these Evangelists.]

in which he made such additions and alterations as he deemed expedient, but “HE DID NOT* PRETEND TO PASS OFF HIS EVANGELIUM AS THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.”

* On this point Mr. Belsham expresses himself, with indignant warmth, at the unfair treatment, which the worthy and learned Marcion has met at the hands of the *orthodox*. Whilst this honest heretic, “did not pretend to pass off his Evangelium as the Gospel of Luke, yet his orthodox reviewers, finding that Luke was his principal authority, rate him most unmercifully for every passage, in which he deviates from *what they choose to represent as his original*, as if he was a voluntary falsifier and corrupter of Luke’s text.” (Append. to Disc. p. 123.) What makes this conduct of the Orthodox the more unjustifiable, is, that, as Mr. Belsham assures us in the same page, “Marcion maintains, *not* that his was a *genuine copy of Luke*, but a *genuine Evangelium*.” Now, undoubtedly, if Marcion’s Gospel was not pretended, by him or his followers, to be a copy of St. Luke’s Gospel, nothing could be more unfair, than to allege its deviations from that gospel, as proofs of its falsification of St. Luke. But, then, the whole of this hard treatment of Marcion turns upon the assertion, that his gospel was meant to be received as a copy of St. Luke’s: for, this being once admitted, no language of accusation on the ground of corruption could be too strong. Now, by whom has this assertion been made? I have often, in the course of these sheets, been compelled to make my reader stare, by stating plain facts; and I have no doubt I shall do so now. The persons, by whom this assertion has been made, and repeated again and again, and dwelt upon as the great foundation of their arguments against the beginning of St. Luke’s Gospel, are—Mr. Belsham, the Editors of the I. V. and their associates. That the Orthodox, indeed, have, upon the position, that Marcion’s Gospel was a copy of St. Luke’s, been so unreasonable as to found the assertion that it must, *in that case*, be condemned as a false and corrupt copy, cannot be denied. But that the *position* itself is a fundamental one with the Unitarian critics, the reader shall have the means of satisfying himself.

First, we shall see what Mr. Belsham says. In describing the degree of weight, which Marcion’s testimony had, in determining his judgment, in the rejection of the first two chapters of St. Luke, he says—“He” (Marcion) “like some *learned Christians* of modern times, rejected, but *as I think* without sufficient reason, all the Evangelical histories, excepting that of Luke.” [It must be a great satisfaction to the orthodox, to

“The liberties which Marcion exercised in forming this ECLECTIC GOSPEL,” Mr. B. admits, *“would not indeed be tolerated in modern times.”* He allows,

find, that Mr. Belsham *really thinks*, there is not quite *sufficient* reason, for rejecting the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, *although* some LEARNED Christians, meaning Mr. Evanson of course, are of a different opinion. But to return to St. Luke.] *“Of THIS Gospel,”* (St. Luke’s) *“WE KNOW, that he”* (Marcion) *“professed to believe, that THE COPY WHICH HE USED was genuine and authentic, and that other copies had been interpolated and corrupted.”*—*“HIS COPY did not contain the history of the miraculous conception, this narrative he therefore rejected,”* &c. (Letters on Arianism, p. 71.) [We may note here, as we pass, how exactly Mr. Belsham, and his brother Editors, have followed the example of Marcion. *“THEIR COPY”* (which they have made for themselves) *“does not contain the history of the miraculous conception: this narrative they THEREFORE (!) reject,”* &c.] Again, as an argument against the narratives of the miraculous conception both in St. Matthew and St. Luke, this writer thus expresses himself, in the very beginning of his *Calm Inquiry*, p. 12. *“The Ebionite Gospel of Matthew, and the Marcionite Gospel of Luke, did not contain these accounts: and both those sects maintained their own to be the UNCORRUPTED, UNMUTILATED COPIES OF THESE EVANGELICAL HISTORIES.”*—Again, what say the Editors; that is, what says Mr. Belsham in another form? Just the same that he has said before. *“The two first chapters of this Gospel were wanting in the copies used by Marcion.”*—*“He, like some moderns, rejected all the evangelical histories excepting Luke, of which he contended that his own was a correct and authentic copy.”* (Imp. Vers. p. 120.) The very same language used here by Mr. Belsham, both in his *individual* and in his *aggregate* capacity, is echoed by Mr. B. in his attack upon the *Quarterly Reviewers* (Month. Repos. vol. iv.) and by the *Calm Inquirer*, in his Address, &c. So that, in every shape in which Mr. Belsham had, or can be suspected to have appeared before the date of his answer to the Bishop of St. David’s, whether open or covert, whether by himself or through his *vicarius*, his note is found to be uniformly the same, that MARCION MAINTAINED HIS GOSPEL TO BE A COPY OF ST. LUKE’S; and also MAINTAINED IT TO BE A CORRECT AND AUTHENTIC COPY. *Now*, he tells us, as we have seen above in his answer to the Bishop of St. David’s, that the assertion, that Marcion’s Gospel was a copy of St. Luke’s, was merely an invention of the wicked orthodox, for the purpose of fastening upon the unoffending Mar-

also, the errors of this heretic to have been extremely gross; and that “he took the liberty of LEAVING OUT, from his copy of the gospel,” (as well

cion, the charge of falsifying Scripture, on the ground of the great dissimilarity between his copy and St. Luke’s Gospel; whereas Mr. Belsham assures us, that Marcion’s Evangelium was a Gospel of his own composition, never intended to pass for a copy of St. Luke’s, nor even asserted by him to be a copy of that Gospel.—Thus we see it is never too late to learn. And that, which had been repeatedly pressed upon Mr. Belsham, and the Unitarians, (but in vain,) as a reason, why nothing *could* be inferred, as to the genuineness of any part of the Gospel of St. Luke, from what was or was not in the Gospel of Marcion, is now brought forward by Mr. Belsham, as an important discovery, to the irreparable disgrace of the *Orthodox*; who, it seems, have hitherto been contending that Marcion’s was designed to be a copy of St. Luke’s Gospel!!! I sincerely wish Mr. Belsham joy of this DISCOVERY; and, at the same time, of its unavoidable result; namely, that we can draw no conclusion, affecting the genuineness of the narrative of the miraculous conception in St. Luke’s Gospel, from the non-existence of this narrative, in a Gospel, which did not affect to be a copy of the Gospel of St. Luke.

However, on looking again into Mr. Belsham, I find we orthodox are not to have the pleasure of his company, throughout the entire of the argument. He has travelled with us through the premises, but he stops short and is absolutely *restive*, at the conclusion. Indeed, he seems to think, that the conclusion *against* the genuineness of the first two chapters of St. Luke’s Gospel is as fairly to be derived from the supposition that Marcion’s Evangelium was *not* a copy of that gospel, as from the supposition that it *was*. Perhaps, he may be right upon this head. But, we must let his reasons speak for themselves. Here, I apprehend, I shall again surprise my readers not less than before. After having made the various concessions, quoted in this note, and in the text above, together with many others, as to the arbitrary nature of the formation of Marcion’s gospel, especially as to his expunging whatever did not correspond with his theories, which are admitted to have been extravagant and absurd, and with which, by the bye, the human birth of Christ under any circumstances was totally incompatible,—our author proceeds to say,—“And, *though it is reasonable to admit, that Marcion LEFT OUT of his Evangelium some passages, WHICH WERE UNFAVOURABLE TO HIS SYSTEM, there is no proof, that he in-*

as from his Apostolicon,) "*those passages, from which it might be inferred, that Jesus was a missionary from the Creator of the world, and the God*

SERTEd any thing, which he did not believe to be authentic." And thus, having endeavoured to clear this gospel of the charge of the INTERPOLATION of *false matter*, he concludes that, "*upon the whole, there is no reason to believe, that the account of the miraculous conception was found in that copy of Luke's Gospel, which Marcion used.*"!!! Here now is the consummation of this most wonderful of all the arguments, that either the author of the *Elements*, or even his critical and logical compeer Mr. Gilchrist, has accomplished. Marcion, who was in the habit of "LEAVING OUT" what he did not approve in the Gospels from which he selected, *could not have left out* the account of the miraculous conception, if it was in that copy of Luke's Gospel which he used. Very well: why not? He could not have left this out.—BECAUSE, "*there is no proof, that he INSERTED any thing which he did not believe to be authentic.*"!!!—He TOOK AWAY many things it is true. But he did NOT TAKE AWAY THIS: BECAUSE, HE MADE NO UNAUTHORIZED ADDITIONS. Or, to put it in a still shorter way: *He did not take away THIS*; BECAUSE, *although he took away whatever he chose, he ADDED nothing*. Learners, undoubtedly, in the elements of numbering, are in the habit of looking to *addition* as the PROOF of *subtraction*.—Really these things can only be laughed at.—And, yet, such are the arguments, which in the nineteenth century, the advocate of revelation is doomed to combat in defence of the *integrity of the sacred text*.

I did think, that I was done with Mr. Belsham, on the subject of this note. But he furnishes matter almost inexhaustible. There is a *variety* in his views of any one subject, that renders it impossible to do him justice, by any thing short of the actual perusal of his productions. And, in truth, unless from direct inspection, the reader cannot easily be brought to credit the perpetual self-contradiction, and direct violations of *known truth*, which openly and glaringly accompany the movements of his pen, on all subjects connected with the Unitarian question. We have seen him, both in the course of this note, and in the quotations from him in the text, earnest to vindicate Marcion from the charge of corrupting St. Luke's Gospel, on the ground of his not having designed or pretended his gospel to be a copy of St. Luke's: and we have seen him ascribe to the invention of the *malevolent orthodox* this unfounded imputation of Marcion's having professed to copy Luke's Gospel;

of the Jews, &c.”—“passages” (in a word) “which were unfavourable to his system.” (Appendix to

whilst, as he is eager to prove, Marcion had really compiled a gospel of his own, which had not Luke’s for its model. We have, undoubtedly, at the same time, seen, that Mr. Belsham himself, and his associates, have been the persons, in modern times, the most anxious, and the most interested, to support the opinion that Marcion’s Gospel was a copy of St. Luke’s. This, however, was maintained by Mr. Belsham, on other occasions, at a distance of time, which might permit him to forget, what, as it had not truth or knowledge for its foundation, might easily be forgotten. But, will it be credited, that, in this very publication, in which he maintains Marcion’s Gospel *not* to have been a copy of St. Luke’s, *nor pretended* to be such, and charges the contrary supposition against the Orthodox as a gross calumny, he himself supports this very supposition with all his might. I must quote him, for I cannot otherwise be believed. “Since Dr. Priestley, and others after him, have appealed to MARCION’S COPY OF THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE,” (we see who the ill minded *orthodox* are, that have viewed Marcion’s Gospel as a supposed copy of St. Luke’s,) “as *an authority for the omission of the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ*, it is astonishing to observe,” (a very astonishing thing indeed,) “with what incredible pains learned men have collected together, the virulent abuse which the *ancient orthodox* writers have heaped upon that famous heretic,” (*all heretics are famous*,) “for corrupting, as they call it,” (certainly a very uncivil name to give it,) “the *genuine scriptures*; that is, in other words, for using a different, and *in some respects, as impartial and well informed critics acknowledge, a more correct copy than themselves*.” (Discourse, &c. p. 117.) Here, then, we find ourselves back again on the old ground. Marcion’s WAS a copy of St. Luke’s Gospel. Dr. Priestley said so, and has turned this to account against St. Luke’s canonical gospel. His followers said the same. Mr Belsham said, and now re-says, the same. The *Orthodox*, so far from affirming this, say, that it differs so widely from St. Luke’s Gospel, that it cannot reasonably be believed to be a copy: and have actually had the baseness to proceed upon the ground of ecclesiastical history, and have quoted the reports of the ancient historians who alone report any thing upon the subject. Mr. Belsham also concurs: he says, that Marcion and St. Luke are *so unlike*, that nothing but the *calumnies* of the Orthodox could ever have given rise to the notion, that the Gospel of the one was meant to be given *as a copy* of

Mr. Belsham's Discourse. March 31, 1814. p. 121—128.)

Thus, then, we have, from an authority, which

the other; for that it was quite a distinct Gospel. Yet, at the same time, (with a rapidity of counter movement, that leaves BRESLAW or the Indian jugglers at immeasurable distance,) this gospel of Marcion's was not only, as Dr. Priestley says, "*a copy of the Gospel of St. Luke,*" but Mr. Belsham assures us, "as impartial and well informed critics acknowledge, a more correct copy" than any of those early fathers, who have given us an account of Marcion, possessed themselves. [Indeed, if I mistake not, Mr. Belsham has somewhere gone nearly the length of saying, that it was a more correct copy of Luke than Luke himself ever wrote. His habits of controversy with Irish professors possibly led him to this view of the subject.] But, extraordinary as all this is, when taken together, the whole that is extraordinary has not yet appeared. Who are "the impartial and well informed critics," that, "acknowledge" the superior correctness of Marcion's copy to that which the orthodox fathers possessed? He tells us, that they are Michaelis and his Annotator: and refers us, at the foot of the page, to the exact passages, viz. "Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iii. part i. p. 271; part ii. p. 159." Now, what do these writers say? Precisely, and unqualifiedly, the opposite, word for word, of that, for which Mr. Belsham has claimed their support. The words of Michaelis are these. St. Luke's Gospel alone was admitted by Marcion, who *made however many alterations in it, so as to render it more suitable to his own system.* But *not all* the alterations in Marcion's copy are to be considered *as wilful corruptions*, for several of them are nothing more, than what modern critics call various readings." This is the WHOLE of what Michaelis has said, upon Marcion's gospel, in the place referred to. The entire of the observations by Michaelis's Annotator, is too long to quote. But the reader, on referring to it, will find, that Dr. Marsh, after speaking of the vast difference between Marcion's gospel and that of St. Luke, proceeds, in refutation of the opinion that the one was a wilfully corrupt copy of the other, to observe;—"That Marcion used St. Luke's Gospel at all, is a position, which has been taken for granted, without the least proof. Marcion himself never pretended, that it was the Gospel of St. Luke, as Tertullian acknowledges, &c." "It is probable, therefore, that he *used some apocryphal gospel*, which had much matter in common with that of St. Luke, but yet was not the same." In support of this he refers

must be decisive in our argument with the Editors of the I. V. being the authority of the *principal* Editor himself, under whose forming hand this Unitarian Version has been fashioned, the full admission of all that can be required upon this subject. It is of little consequence, that what is here admitted, is the most direct possible contradiction to all that this head Editor and his subalterns, have hitherto, maintained; and maintained, as the *essential ground* of their rejection of the first two chapters of Luke: nor is it of the smallest consequence, that, by the application of that miraculous *logic*, by which the author of the *Elements* has already wrought such wonders, he has contrived to arrive at the very conclusion, which his premises directly overturn. The grand point stands admitted,—that *the Evangelium of Marcion was not a copy of the Gospel of St. Luke, nor intended as such.* We shall, therefore,

to Griesbach, and to Loeffler, both of whom maintain, that Marcion's was not, nor was pretended to be, a copy of St. Luke's Gospel.—Thus, then, to show, that Michaelis and Dr. Marsh affirm, that Marcion used a more correct copy of St. Luke than the orthodox fathers, he produces the former, as saying, that Marcion *wilfully* corrupted Luke, although ALL the alterations he made in Luke's Gospel ought not to be pronounced *wilful corruptions*: and the latter as saying, that the difference is so immense, that Marcion *could not* have intended to give a copy of St. Luke, but *must have used some apocryphal gospel.*

Thus are unlearned Unitarians abused by this writer, whom they refer to as their oracle. And, unfortunately, as Unitarians, in general, read none but the writings of Unitarians, he is enabled to abuse them in this manner, without the danger of detection. The truth is, the more I have been obliged to examine of this writer's productions, the more I am satisfied, that he is not to be trusted to in a *single quotation.* I have often been obliged to feel the force of the position, that the *religion of modern Unitarians is not the religion of TRUTH.* No writer impresses this sentiment more strongly upon my mind, than that one who styles himself a Calm Inquirer.—The thing is shameful and disgusting.

I trust, now that so much light has broken in upon the Editors, and that the facts of Ecclesiastical history are coming by degrees somewhat within their view, hear no more of the want of the first two chapters in Marcion's copy of St. Luke's Gospel, *there having been no such copy*. And, as little, I trust, shall we hear of the want of the first two chapters in the *Ebionite* copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, there being as little reason to pronounce that any such copy of that gospel ever existed. Those, who may have been weak enough, to reject the history of the incarnation of our blessed Lord from the gospels, on the assurances of these critics, may now see what guides they have followed: yet, to such as by false lights have been led to make shipwreck of their faith, it will be but a poor compensation to discover, that it is to the ignorance of those who promised a safe steerage, they owe their misfortune.

To bring this subject to a close, I shall here lay before the reader the one grand sweeping argument of the prime champion and leading Editor of the Unitarian Version, whereby the histories of the miraculous conception are at once banished from the genuine gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. It has been already quoted in the last note (see page 457.) but it deserves to take a station here also. "The *Ebionite* gospel of Matthew and the Marcionite gospel of Luke did not contain these accounts: and both those sects maintained their own to be the uncorrupted, unmutilated copies of these evangelical histories." Now, after what has been said, the reader will I apprehend, be prepared to follow me in saying, that in this whole sentence, whose object is at once to expunge four chapters from the gospels, in the hope of excluding the doctrine of the Incarnation from the New Testament,

there is *not a single clause, that has the slightest foundation in fact.* That there was a Marcionite Gospel of Luke, and still more that the Marcionites maintained their gospel to be an uncorrupted un-mutilated copy of Luke's history, are statements, now *admitted* by their very propounders to be utterly false. No less false have we shewn the corresponding statements* respecting the *Ebionite* copies, whether these gentlemen admit them to be so or not. And, therefore, with these heretics and their absurd admirers of modern times, we need for the present take no further trouble, on the subject of the genuineness of the Evangelical narratives of

* We may here defy the Calm Inquirer, and his brother Editors, together with all the Unitarian Missionaries, (north, south, east, and west,) to adduce a single passage from any ancient writer, in which the truth of Mr. Belsham's statement above given, respecting the Ebionites, receives support; namely, *that this sect maintained its gospel to be an uncorrupted un-mutilated copy of St. Matthew.* He has already admitted, that he had averred the like *untruly* of the Marcionites. He has not dealt *less untruly* by the one than by the other. The fact is, that, of the two, there is even more colour for making the assertion, in the case of the Marcionites, than in that of the Ebionites. A passage of Tertullian, (Adv. Marcion, lib. iv. cap. 5.) misunderstood or misrepresented, might be drawn in to furnish some *pretence*, (as indeed it has been so used,) for the position, that the Marcionites averred their gospel to be a copy of St. Luke's. But, they will find it difficult to discover any passage in the writings of the ancients, from which it can fairly be inferred, that the Ebionites affirmed their gospel to be a copy of St. Matthew. Epiphanius's assertion, (Hæres. 30. §. 13.) that the "imperfect, spurious, and mutilated," copy of the gospel, which the Ebionites had, was *spoken of* as *κατα Ματθαιον*, would not of itself prove that the Ebionites *called* their gospel a copy of St. Matthew's; but when coupled with the words *Εβραϊκον δε τουτο καλουσι*, it loses all its force, since the testimony goes to show, that the Ebionites themselves called it the Gospel of the Hebrews, however it might in common use, have received the former appellation. And we have already seen, that the gospel, from which the Ebionites formed theirs, bore, on the face of it, the declaration, that it was composed by the Apostles at large.

the miraculous conception: and shall now take our leave of them on this head, simply premising this one observation; that, if all, that this extravagant and unfounded sentence contended for, were true, it would avail nothing for the purpose for which it is designed, so long as it is notorious, that the very earliest proof we have, of the *non-existence* of the narratives of the miraculous conception in the respective gospels of these heretics, is *much later*, in point of time, than the* date, to which, we can carry

* Campbell has well remarked, (Four Gospels, &c. vol. iv. p. 21.) that "the *old Italic* translation and the *Syriac* were probably made before the name EBIONITE was known in the church." He might, of course, have made the like assertion, of the name MARCIONITE also. At all events it may be made, without much hazard, with respect to those *Ebionite* and *Marcionite* GOSPELS, which are brought forward in opposition to the received Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. The great antiquity of those versions, the Editors themselves, (as indeed there can be but one opinion upon the subject,) have freely and fully admitted in their Introduction, pp. xv. xvi. And they have truly added, that the value of these very ancient versions is immense, as being made, of course from manuscripts of the highest antiquity. All this however, is forgotten by the Editors and their Calm Inquirers, when they come to compare the Ebionite and Marcionite *copies* (as they call them, *copies of what?*) with the *Manuscripts of the Gospels which now exist*. The Ebionite and Marcionite copies, "were much older than any of these," they say. Well, but, how much older were they than the manuscripts from which the Syriac and old Italic versions were made? They do not tell us that. Or how much older were they than the manuscripts from which our present Alexandrian, Vatican, Parisian, and Cambridge, or, generally speaking, from which our present oldest manuscripts were made? They do not tell us that either. But again, how old are these Ebionite and Marcionite COPIES? And WHERE are these copies? The answer is. *They do not exist: and we know nothing either of their existence or their contents, but what we learn from the writings of the Fathers*. Well then, it is plain, we can argue about their existence and their contents, only from what the FATHERS tell us.

Now, as to the Ebionites, who is the first, that informs us,

up, *beyond question*, the existence of the narratives in the genuine gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. So that, in every possible way, in which we can

that they had a gospel which wanted the history of the miraculous conception. Epiphanius is, by the confession of the Editors, the earliest writer who has said so, or rather, he is the only early writer who has said so, as Dr. Lawrence has proved, in refutation of the Editors, who seem resolved to have an Ecclesiastical history of their own, as well as a New Testament, and have in defiance of fact produced Jerome as a joint authority with Epiphanius. Well then, about the middle of the *fourth* century, we have an account of the existence AT THAT TIME, of an *Ebionite* Gospel, called by some the Gospel of Matthew, and in this the first two chapters of Matthew were not found. Is this gospel, *so wanting these chapters*, traced back by this or any other writer to an earlier period? No. Well then, this is to supplant the genuine copies of St. Matthew's Gospel established by decisive proofs for more than two centuries before. (See p. 210—225, and especially p. 218 of this vol. It is to supplant the gospel, which *every* existing unmutilated Manuscript, and *every* ancient Version whatsoever, attests to have been the gospel received in the Christian church from the beginning, and to which the writings of the Fathers uniformly bear the like attestation.

Again, respecting Marcion's Evangelium, or *supposed* copy of St. Luke, from whom have we the earliest account of this gospel, as being defective in the account of our Lord's nativity? From Irenæus, very near the conclusion of the second century, which Lardner justly fixes for the time of that Father's writing his Five Books against Heresies, in which he notices this fact concerning Marcion's Gospel. Here then, about the conclusion of the second century, and not to any earlier period that we know of, can we fix, as an *ascertained* fact, the existence of a copy of the *Marcionite* Gospel, wanting the account of the Nativity. Indeed, Marcion himself, by the best accounts, flourished not, until near the middle of this century. So that, even supposing Marcion's copy, as described by Irenæus, to have remained unaltered from its first composition by that heretic, we see that we cannot in any way presume on the existence of it, at a period earlier than about the middle of the second century; and even this, *gratuitous*, as to its being, in the time of Marcion, what it was found to be when Irenæus wrote against it.

What, then, has become of the *antiquity* of Marcion's COPY OF LUKE, *wanting the first two chapters of that gospel*? And still

view the matter, the proof, which the Unitarians labour to advance against the chapters in question, is simply a proof of their desire to get rid of them, at all hazards, and against all evidence, because

more, as we have seen, what has become of the *antiquity* of the Ebionite COPIES OF MATTHEW, wanting likewise, the first two chapters of this Evangelist. We cannot, with certainty, speak of the one, as earlier than the latter part of the second century; nor of the other, as earlier than the middle of the fourth century. And is this, after all, the boasted *antiquity* of the DOCUMENTS, before which, even admitting them to be designed as copies of the Gospels whose names have been ascribed to them, all the copies and proofs of the genuine canonical Gospels which are to be found in the existing Manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers, and which the Manuscripts, Versions, and Fathers, UNANIMOUSLY sustain, are at once to vanish! Productions, which are not copies, even if they had antiquity; which have not antiquity, even if they were copies; and which, even if they both were copies and had antiquity, the very persons who produce them discredit, by rejecting in every part but that for which they adduce them;—seem not exactly the authorities, on which sober and well-intending christians would rely, in settling the canon of true Scripture; and of course mark, pretty plainly, the character of those persons, who would thus employ them.

As to the unquestionable antiquity of the canonical gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, containing as they do at present the chapters relating to the miraculous conception, it must be unnecessary, after the writings of Lardner, Michaelis, and Less, to make any observations. To this last writer, being now placed within the reach of the English reader by Mr. Kingdon's translation, I would refer particularly at page 89, of the *Authenticity, &c.* of the New Testament.—Having mentioned this writer, I cannot, although it is not necessarily connected with the present subject, omit to direct the reader's attention to his able and important observations, upon the value of Irenæus's testimony to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, to be found at page 115 of the work just cited. I am the more desirous to do this, because especial pains have been taken, (as may be seen at p. 121, of the Answer to the Bishop of St. David's, already noticed,) to disparage the authority of this early and venerable father, on account of the illustration, which he has fancifully applied, to the fact of the existence of but four gospels. The reflections of a serious and impartial enquirer

they are resolved not to believe the facts which these chapters contain.—Why will not the Unitarian critics learn to distinguish between the *authenticity* and the *credibility* of the writings of the New Testament? Or, rather, I should say of *some* of them,* why will they *purposely* confound them.

after truth, will hereby become contrasted with the light and presumptuous petulance of modern unbelievers, whose great pleasure it is to make a mock of serious things and serious persons; and to whom one of the smallest objects of regard manifestly appears to be, *the truth as it is in Christ*.

* The strong language, which, here, and in many other places I have been forced to employ, in my observations upon Unitarian writers, I wish to be considered, as designed to apply only to Unitarians of a certain class: such Unitarians as correspond to the description given of UNITARIANS by Mr. Belsham, in his Review of Mr. Wilberforce and in his *Calm Inquiry*; such in short as may be considered proper and perfect specimens, of what the unqualified culture of Unitarian principles can effect. There are writers, who bear the same denomination, who are of a very different order indeed; and who have not so devoted themselves to the objects of a party, as to have turned their backs upon every thing like sober and conscientious investigation, and, indeed upon all the decencies, usually observed in the treatment of serious subjects, but particularly in the discussion of religious truths. Such writers as Dr. Estlin, Mr. Frend, and Dr. Carpenter, staunch as they are in the support of the fundamental Unitarian principle, I should feel concerned, indeed, to be supposed to confound with writers, in whom the love of truth seems to have completely yielded to the pride of party. I should be sorry to be supposed to mix such men with Mr. Gilchrist or the *Calm Inquirer*. Dr. Carpenter, (*Unit. the Doct. &c.* pp. 353. 354.) has made the distinction in treating of the introductory chapters of St. Luke, which I have pointed to above. And he very fairly observes; “As to the external evidence against the genuineness of the Introduction, it appears to me very slight. We have *only* the judgment of Marcion, who lived, however, in the early part of the second century, without knowing the grounds of his judgment to enable us to ascertain its value.” Again, as to the internal difficulties in this part of St. Luke, he admits, that “there is only one of them which can weigh much against the *great body of external evidence*.” This difficulty he endeavours to show, may be re-

The next point, which I am called upon to defend, in the Remarks upon the Unitarian Version, is the observation, (to be found at pages 201, and 203 of this volume,) on the inconsistency of the *Editors*, in rejecting the first chapters of *St. Matthew* as spurious, because they represent *Herod* as still living, at the time when *Christ* was born; and at the same time admitting as unquestionable, the *Gospel* of the EBIONITES, which pronounces *Herod* to be living so late as thirty years after our Lord's nativity. This the Editors pronounce, through their Calm Inquirer, to be a mere "cavil unworthy of a man of sense," &c. (Address, p. 11.) My observation concerning the Ebionite gospel, was grounded upon that, which the Editors not only concede, but contend for; viz. that the *Ebionite* gospel began with these* words, "In the days of HEROD KING OF JUDEA,

moved by a particular explanation, conformed to his own Unitarian views; but the difficulty itself existed only in reference to the Unitarian hypothesis. Here, however, although he reasons, as might be expected from a person holding his opinions concerning the nature of Christ, he does not deny plain facts; he does not scoff at the weight of evidence, in its own nature irresistible to a fair mind; nor does he exalt the heretic Marcion upon the ruins of the mass of MSS. Versions, and Fathers, that sustain the introductory chapters of Luke, merely because this heretic may be turned (dishonestly) to account in favour of the Unitarian cause.

* Η δε αρχὴ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίου ἐστὶν; ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΣ, ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βαπτισμᾶ μετανόας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλεγτο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, πατρὶς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισβετ, καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες. (Epiphan. Hæres. 30. §. 13.)

"The beginning of their gospel was this: 'It came to pass in the days of HEROD THE KING OF JUDEA, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan; who was said to be of the family of Aaron the High-Priest, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and all people went out after him.'"—The learned Michaelis says, of "this strange historical blunder, which makes John Baptist preach in the time of Herod king of Judea, who had been dead nearly thirty years, when John began to preach;" that the passage appears to have been fabrica-

John came baptizing," &c. But, they say, this is easily explained: for that "some early transcriber had erroneously written JUDEA for GALILEE; and so the *cavil* is disposed of.

Now, *similar* as these two words are, (*so similar*, indeed, that the very persons, who cannot admit that ΘC could have passed into OC by any error of transcribing or otherwise, are quite satisfied, that the similarity of these must have led to the substitution of the one for the other,) yet, one thing has been forgotten, which very much weakens the force of this argument from resemblance; namely, that

ted, by an absurd composition of two different passages in St. Luke's Gospel, namely, "chap. i. 5. and iii. 1, 2, 3."—And, "in like manner," he says, "the words βαπτίζων βαπτισμα υστερον εις τον ιερδαν ποταμον, appear to have been put together from Mark i. 4. and Matth. iii. 6." (Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iii. part 1. p. 179.) The objections made to these observations of this acute enquirer are destitute of weight. The magnitude of the blunder is a weak ground indeed: it only affords privilege to ignorance. And the selection from various gospels can create no difficulty, where the document itself is, as we have already seen, (and as is contended for by Michaelis,) formed by compilation. Indeed, the very passage before us, is, in itself, a decisive proof of this; unless it can be said, that John's being the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, &c. is to be found in St. Matthew's Gospel, and therefore need not be supposed to be derived from that of St. Luke. A favourite hypothesis is a great enemy to impartial investigation. And the theory of a common Hebrew document, has interfered, more than it ought, with many important truths affecting the Gospels. On this subject I am unwilling to say more. I could wish not to be compelled to say so much.

The 5th verse of the first chapter of St. Luke begins with the words, Ἐγενετο εν ταις ημεραις ηραδου του βασιλεως της ιουδαίας. The reader will judge for himself, whether the framer of the gospel, described at the beginning of this note, had this passage in view. And he will be the better able to form his judgment, when he finds this very verse proceed to speak of Zacharias and Elizabeth of the family of Aaron, and followed by an account of the birth of John from these parents. St. Luke's is the only gospel in which the full title, KING OF JUDEA, is given to Herod.

the word KING, *also*, must have been by the early transcriber erroneously written for TETRARCH. The matter, we see, is accounted for by “a slip of the pen,”—the way, in which, whatever plain and palpable errors arise, (i. e. on the side of *Unitarianism*,) is properly to be explained. (See Address, &c. p. 14.) All this, perhaps, may be very well, so long as we consider the case of a *single* slip. If the transcriber had, by “a slip,” EITHER WRITTEN JUDEA FOR GALILEE, OR KING FOR TETRARCH, however the *striking similitude* in each couplet may be supposed to have rendered this admissible; yet, it is too much to reckon upon *both slips at once*; and still more to reckon upon such a *coincidence* of slips, as should bring together *just the two words that consort*;—since, to have stumbled either upon *Herod** KING OF GALILEE, OR upon *Herod* TETRARCH of JUDEA, would undoubtedly, have appeared somewhat awkward, to those used to the language of Jewish history concerning the kings and governors of those countries. No: no. There is no* mistake of transcrib-

* That the general denomination of King, should be sometimes used for Herod who was the Tetrarch, where no formal designation was intended, and where no reference was made to the country which constituted his Tetrarchy, is a matter which may be conceded: the Tetrarch being the ostensible Sovereign or Prince, to which the term βασιλεως, in a loose sense of the word, might not improperly be applied. But *in connexion with the country over which he presided*, I leave it for the industrious research of the Editors and all their Calm Inquirers, to discover a single instance of the application of the title of KING, to any one of the Tetrarchs, who succeeded in the government of the divided dominions of Herod the Great. They will, if they can, produce an example of Herod Antipas being entitled King of Galilee, or of Herod Philip being entitled King of Iturea and Trachonitis; and it will be still better, if they can produce an example of either of them, entitled KING OF JUDEA.

* In addition to the great improbability of the *two chances*, in the errors of transcribing, just *falling together*, so as to make a *concordant whole*; we have, also, to consider the great un-

ers. It is the plain direct blunder, of a garbled document, which was the production of an age, far removed from the time of which it treats: and in which, we have seen enough of blundering already

likelihood, of the transcriber having made this double error, or indeed any error, in the *very first sentence* of the document. In *longo sermone*, it is true, the *quandoque bonus dormitat* may be allowed to the transcriber more reasonably even than to the poet. But that he should nod, or rather I should say, dream, in the very first sentence, this is not quite so credible. It might as well be said, that the *title* itself was given wrong, by an error of the transcriber; and that by a mere slip of the pen, the words "Gospel according to St. Matthew," placed at the head of a document to be transcribed, were changed into "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans." It will be remembered, that the sentence in question, is not only the first sentence in this Ebionite document, but that it is designed to mark the *exact date* of the transaction, with which the history contained in this document, commences; to specify the precise time of the grand event, to which the whole history relates. So that, if there were any one sentence in the entire, in which the transcriber might be supposed completely secured against the danger of mistake, it must be this. It was the first; and it was the most important.

The historian says, as Mr. Belsham informs us, that it was in the days of Herod the TETRARCH OF GALILEE, that John began to baptize. The transcriber, as Mr. Belsham also informs us, has, by an error of his pen, fixed this event in the days of Herod the KING OF JUDEA. And the same critic who informs us of these two things, at the same time assigns, what affords a reason for the carelessness, that could have led to this error. For, he adds, (as we see above) that no child who was taught to read could mistake Herod the king, or (for he is very desirous to confound them) tetrarch of Galilee, who was living at the time of our Lord's crucifixion, for *that* Herod, who died in the reign of Augustus, and who was the father of Herod the Tetrarch. Here, then, we have an excuse for the transcriber. He must have been perfectly at ease upon the subject. It must be a matter of indifference, whether he wrote Tetrarch of Galilee, or King of Judea; because *any child* could correct the error. The event would itself determine the date; contrary to what we have been weakly supposing in this note, that the date was intended to determine the event.

at pages 446, 447, to reconcile us to any *degree* of it, that might be exhibited in addition.

The Editors, indeed, through their Calm Inquirer, go on to say, "that no child that was taught to read, ever mistook Herod the king, or tetrarch, of Galilee, who beheaded John, and who was living at the time of our Lord's crucifixion, for that Herod who died in the reign of Augustus, and who was the father of Herod the Tetrarch:" and they conclude with exclaiming against the attempt "to *impose* by such miserable sophistry." The "*sophistry*" consists in simply *stating* the blunder, which, it is confessed, appears on the face of this *Ebionite* document: and the refutation of it lies in asserting the blunder to be* *so great*, that it is *impossible* it ever could have been made; and so, the *two slips* of the transcriber's pen come in, aided by the *great similitude* between the words JUDEA and GALILEE, and between the words KING and TETRARCH.

But, what will the Editors and their Calm Inquirer say, if I produce them an instance, of this *impossible blunder* having been *actually* made, two hundred years before the time, at which we have any proof of the existence of the *Ebionite* gospel, in which this passage is found: and this, not by a *child who had not yet learned to read*, but by a *great philosopher*, of whose arguments, or rather of whose blasphemous sneers, against the divinity of our Lord,

* In truth there is a solution of the problem, that reduces somewhat the extravagance of the blunder; and although it must still leave the result, fatal to the authority of this *Ebionite* document, from the grossness of the anachronism which cannot be done away with; yet, it affords some slight apology for the lapse, in addition to that which distance from the date of the event so obviously supplies. But I leave it to the admirers of these *Ebionite* compilers, to make the discovery, of what may tend, in some degree, to repair the credit of their favourites; although it cannot set up the authority of their document.

our Unitarian critics have not unfrequently availed themselves; and by a philosopher, who had called to his aid, the most learned Jews of his time, to enable him to compose his *True Word*, in opposition to the gospel. I mean no less a person than the celebrated CELSUS; who, whatever the illiberal orthodox may think of him, will surely not rank low in the opinion of such Unitarians as the Editors and the Calm Inquirer; and who, it is to be presumed, the modesty of these gentlemen will lead them to admit, possessed more of knowledge and talents than they can collectively lay claim to. Now come we to the IMPOSSIBLE BLUNDER.

“It was given out by Jesus, that Chaldeans were moved at the time of his birth, to come and worship him, as a God, when he was but a little child, and that this was told to HEROD THE TETRARCH, (HPΩΔΗ ΤΩ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΗ τουτο δεδηλωκεναι) who issued out an order to have all killed,” &c. What is Lardner’s remark upon this? See his Works, vol. viii. p. 21. where the reader who may not have Origen’s book to refer to, will find the passage here quoted. This learned writer, and truly Calm Inquirer, whose errors even can never do away the respect that is due to the man, thus observes. “I would here make two remarks upon Celsus mistaking (Herod) KING OF ALL JUDEA, in whose time Jesus was born, for his son Herod, THE TETRARCH OF GALILEE. First, we see the great difficulty, of *any writer’s* taking upon himself, the character of a more early age, than that in which he lives, without committing some great mistakes.” “Secondly, since *so learned a man* as CELSUS, about the *middle of the second century*, has made *such a blunder* in history, the Christian writers of the same age or later, ought not to be too severely treated for any mistakes of the like kind.”

I will now leave the Editors, and their Calm Inquirer, to settle the remainder of this subject with Dr. Lardner: on whom, of course, the charge of "*miserable sophistry*" must fall, if they be right. They say, that a child even, *provided* he had learned to read, *could not* have made this blunder; and that it is an attempt to "impose upon" the reader by "*miserable sophistry*," to pretend that he could. Dr. Lardner says, that, even, a *learned philosopher*, not far removed from the time of Christ's birth, *could* make such a blunder, and assigns for the assertion no other reason, than that such a person *has* made it.

It must be confessed, indeed, that Celsus has made some *other* blunders; which may, to the Unitarian critics, with whom we are concerned, appear to the full as objectionable, as that which we have just noticed: so that, from the repetition of his blunders, they may be led to object to him as a fair example on the present question. The blunders, to which I allude, are his references to the accounts of the miraculous conception, contained in the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke; which would, of themselves, be sufficient to establish the early and unquestioned existence of those chapters. This is a species of blunder, which these Unitarian critics cannot easily forgive. We have already at p. 436—439. of this volume, observed upon the evidence, derived from Celsus, to St. Matthew's narrative of the miraculous conception. The confirmation, which he affords to that contained in St. Luke's Gospel, may be seen in Lardner; to whose Works, (vol. viii. p. 6—68,) I refer the reader, for full satisfaction, concerning the value and extent of the hostile testimony of Celsus.

Two or three points, of those adverted to in the REMARKS ON THE UNITARIAN VERSION, yet remain to be

noticed, together with the observations, which have been made upon these, by the Editors through their *Calm Inquirer*. The points alluded to are to be found at p. 202—209, of this volume. These sheets, however, have already so far exceeded the intended bounds, as necessarily to preclude the further prosecution of this subject at present. But, I am induced to regret this the less, because I conceive it to be desirable, to present the whole of the animadversions upon the Unitarians, and their New Version, in one collective form, and in a separate tract, in which I shall have it in my power to enter more largely into the subject, than was practicable in the present work. For that tract I shall reserve, what remains to be offered, on the points, to which I have alluded. Of these, the principal relates to the objection, raised by the Editors, on the ground of St. Luke's report of our Lord's age in the 15th of Tiberius, against the genuineness of the evangelical narratives of the miraculous conception. The examination of this topic is now the more important, as the chronological contradiction, which is here contended for, has, in truth, become the forlorn hope of the Editors. From the arguments against the introductory chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, derived from the pretended *Ebionite* and *Marcionite* copies of these Gospels, they appear to have been for some time gradually receding, if we may judge from Mr. Belsham's answer to the *Bishop of St. David's Brief Memorial*, and other of their recent publications. In these, they seem to be preparing for themselves, a retreat from the old favourite ground of the *Ebionites* and *Marcion*: and I cannot avoid indulging in the hope, that what has been offered in these pages, will not tend in any degree to retard this retrograde movement. Now, as to the fastness to which they seem

resolved to retire, for the purpose of making their last stand, I do not mean to take to myself much credit, and I trust it will hereafter appear that I make no boast, when I say, that I shall not find much trouble in dispossessing them of that. In truth, I must confess, that these critics have themselves supplied me with some aid towards the accomplishment of this object: insomuch, that I am sanguine enough to expect, not only, that I shall satisfy my reader of the truth of my positions, at pages 204 and 205,—that the Editors have in their reference to Lardner, confounded the true with the vulgar era of the nativity; and that they “have adduced the authority of Lardner’s name in behalf of a position which Lardner has most triumphantly overthrown,”—but, that I shall also convince him, that even the very shewing of the Editors and their *Calm Inquirer*, supplies sufficient data, to evince, that St. Luke does not contradict the alleged date of our Lord’s birth, as given in either of the narratives of the miraculous conception. And, thus, by the arithmetical aid of the Unitarians themselves, I hope to be enabled to prove, even to their own satisfaction, that the contradiction of dates, which (as they tell us) has *compelled* them to reject four chapters out of the received canon of the gospels, does not exist; and that, therefore, they may, without the smallest offence to that *delicacy of conscience* which led them to reject these chapters, now replace them, fairly printed and stripped of their Italic stigma, in their new translation.—I trust, also, that, in return for the aid, thus bestowed by the Unitarian Editors, in clearing the character of the gospels from the alleged appearance of chronological inconsistency respecting the birth of Christ, I shall have it in my power to render them some compensation, on another head, already remarked upon at

pages 205 and 206; by shewing, that when they spoke of *Ephrem Syrus*, as "*a writer of some note in the sixth century*," they had better ground for the assertion, than has been generally supposed: so that, if they did fall into any confusion respecting this ancient writer, it was a confusion arising (at all events) out of a certain degree of knowledge; and the mistake is, therefore, not to be charged to that utter *carelessness*, which the *Calm Inquirer* would impute to the Editors, when he attributes it (as he has done in his Address, at p. 14,) to a mere "slip of the pen or error of the press." The Editors, it will appear, have not been *quite* so thoughtless and negligent, as their own vindicator would represent them to have been, in preparing their *great work* for the public eye. The discussion of these, and other points, connected with the subject matter of the Remarks, I expect soon to commit to the press. In the mean time, I comfort myself with the hope, that what has been already submitted, in this *Supplement*, will tend to throw some further light upon the nature of the Unitarian Version of the New Testament; upon the true character of modern Unitarians; and upon that of their system, and of the plans adopted for its promotion. And here, as I have done before, I must beg to be understood by my reader, as speaking of the *Unitarians* and their system, in reference to the description given of those who bear that name, by their chief advocate, Mr. Belsham. On all occasions, he professes to represent their sentiments: and, in that representation the Body seem generally to acquiesce. To those, who correspond not to Mr. Belsham's description, my observations, are of course, not intended to apply: and all such, who, individually, may feel cause to complain of the justness of those observations, as directed against Unitarians generally,

must cast the blame upon him who has given them application, not upon him by whom they have been but conditionally pronounced. Opinions, shocking to every pious mind, revolting to every well informed understanding, essentially repugnant to christian doctrines, and essentially subversive of christian principles, have been promulgated by Mr. Belsham, and a few other individuals. These opinions I have laboured to expose; and have not scrupled, in strong terms (though in terms very inadequate, indeed,) to condemn. Mr. Belsham pronounces such to be the opinions of those, whom he entitles *Unitarians*. It is for all, who do not maintain such opinions, to disclaim this title. Some, whom Mr. Belsham and his associates have so denominated, have already declined the honour intended for them in ranking them of this class. And I rejoice to have it in my power to announce, with respect to this island, that the imputation of Unitarianism has been disclaimed for the whole: and this, by an authority unquestionable on such a subject; the authority of a gentleman of distinguished respectability, who ranks high amongst the dissenting ministry of Ireland, and whose perfect acquaintance with the state of the Dissenters throughout this country, gives to his testimony in matters connected with the concerns of that body, a decisive weight. From the testimony of this gentleman we learn, that there is *not one Unitarian congregation in Ireland*. I subjoin the letter* of Dr. Bruce,

* The letter of Dr. Bruce, above referred to, was addressed to the Editor of the Monthly Repository, in consequence of an article, which had previously appeared in that Unitarian Journal on the subject of "IRISH UNITARIANS." This article had exultingly announced the flourishing state of Unitarianism in Ireland; and had enumerated several ministers and congregations, decidedly Unitarian, throughout the Island. The letter

which announces a fact, that must be so gratifying to every Christian mind : and, this I do, not merely for the purpose of shewing, that this country, hap-

dated from Belfast, June 10, 1813, is as follows.—“ Sir, When looking into your Repository for Dec. 1812, [vii. 753,] I find my name introduced in a manner liable to misconception. It is one of those instances, in which your readers are often misled by the usurpation of the title of Unitarians on the part of the Socinians. This is a continual source of confusion in your publication, and sometimes exposes it to the suspicion of disingenuity. As I accept of the denomination of Arian without subscribing to the creed of Arius, I shall take the liberty of addressing you as a Socinian, without insinuating that you adopt any opinions of Socinus which you disavow. The confusion arising from this equivocal use of the word Unitarian, appeared of late very remarkable in your American correspondence : and as you candidly corrected that misrepresentation with respect to America, I hope you will not refuse a speedy insertion of what I have to say concerning Ireland. I have a very general knowledge of the Dissenters of this country ; and can venture to assert, that there is not one Socinian congregation in Ireland. In the Southern Association, one or two ministers and about a dozen of the laity may entertain such sentiments. In the Northern counties, which contain between 400,000 and 500,000 Presbyterians, including seceders, I do not know of one minister who denies the pre-existence of our Lord, though I am intimately acquainted and connected with the most liberal divines of that body. The Methodists, Covenanters, Moravians, and Evangelical Societies cannot be suspected of Socinianism : and the Quakers have of late been anxious to disclaim that doctrine.”

Dr. Bruce, after noticing by name certain dissenting ministers, for the purpose of vindicating them from the imputation of Unitarianism, cast upon them in the article, on which he animadverts, thus proceeds.—“ The excessive spirit of proselytism which actuates so many of your correspondents, is not always confined to the living. It is a favourite opinion among them, that Newton and Locke were Socinians. The evidence for this is brought forward in your Number for July, 1810, though I think little to the satisfaction of the writer himself. Sir Isaac Newton is claimed on the strength of *verbal* expressions, which he is said to have used to a Mr. Haynes. For the truth of this we are referred to a Mr. Baron, himself a Socinian, who says, that Mr. Haynes, from whom he had it, was the most zealous Socinian he

pily, still remains uninfected by the poison of the Socinian or Unitarian heresy; still enjoys that freedom from a pernicious contagion, on which, fifteen

ever knew; and therefore surely not an unexceptionable witness. For this quotation from Mr. Baron's tract we are again referred to Mr. Lindsey's apology. This is slight ground for forming an opinion of the sentiments of so great a man, who wrote so largely on religion. As to the quotation from Sir Isaac's own writings, it might as well come from an Arian, or indeed from any Protestant, as from a Socinian." Dr. Bruce then proceeds, in considerable detail, and with unanswerable force of argument and evidence, to rescue the name of Locke from the stigma of Socinianism. He shews, not only that his explications of Scripture are inconsistent with the charge, but that he has himself in the strongest terms denied and repelled it: and he concludes his observations upon this subject, by pointing out Locke's manifest opposition to "modern Socinians on almost every article of their creed." For example, "He did not believe Christ to have been a mortal man of the seed of Adam; he was neither a necessarian nor a materialist: he believed in the incarnation and miraculous conception, and in the separate nature and existence of the soul and body of Christ, and did not scruple to use the phrase, 'for the sake of Jesus Christ.'" (Monthly Rep. vol. viii. p. 515—517.)

I regret, that space does not permit me to lay before the reader the whole of Dr. Bruce's excellent observations upon this head. Joined with those of the Bishop of St. David's, and the remarks on the same point to be found in other parts of these pages, they supply what, to every candid mind must appear demonstration, that Locke's opinions were as far removed from those of the Unitarians, as the East is from the West. Before I advert to other points connected with the subject of this letter, it may be expedient to apprise the reader, that Dr. Priestley, the great patriarch of modern Socinianism, maintained, that there was "no more reason, why a *man* should be supposed to have an immaterial principle within him than a *dog*: and therefore, from his total rejection of "the doctrine of a soul," he inferred "the divinity and the pre-existence of Christ," to be "contrary to reason." (See Tracts in controv. with Horsley, pp. 18. 19.) This will explain the force of Dr. Bruce's observation in the clause preceding the conclusion of the passage last quoted from his letter.

I must subjoin a few words, here, to what Dr. Bruce has said upon this plan of *posthumous proselytism* (I may call it,)

years ago, I offered my congratulations to the public, in the first impression of this work;—but, also, for the purpose of affording a decisive proof, that it

lately adopted by the Unitarians. In addition to the names of Locke and Newton, they have been extremely anxious to claim that of Clarke, under various pretences. The Bishop of St. David's has abundantly shewn, (in his Postscript to the Bible, &c.) how little reason there is, for ascribing to Dr. Clarke, the Socinianized Liturgy, on which the Unitarians ground their right to associate him with the favourers of Unitarian principles. I have just seen a publication of Dr. Mant's, in which additional light is thrown upon this subject. See the preface to his Academical Sermons.—It is, fortunately, not necessary, to adduce, from Dr. Clarke's writings, proofs of his *anti-Socinianism*, with which they abound. Dr. Lardner has saved us that trouble. In his Letter on the Logos, in which he exerts himself to the utmost in the cause of Unitarianism, he asserts of Dr. Clarke, that he “cannot forbear saying, that his interpretations of texts are *generally false*, arising, as from other causes, so particularly from *an aversion to Sabellian or Socinian senses*.” (Works, vol. xi. p. 112.) So much for Dr. Clarke's Socinian tendencies and Socinian Liturgy.

The attempt on the memory of Dr. Watts, is, if possible, still more flagrant, than any other instance of the Socinian exhumation of distinguished persons, who had lived and died in a christian faith. In defiance of every existing production of Dr. Watts' pen, in defiance of the most established notoriety as to his religious opinions, and in defiance of the testimony of those with whom he lived in daily and hourly intercourse, the Unitarians are now labouring to associate with their cause, the name of that excellent and exalted christian. It is in vain, that proof is heaped upon proof; and that Mr. Palmer has lately adduced evidence rationally irresistible, to shew, that Dr. Watts' opinions remained, through life, opposed to every doctrine of a Socinian bearing; still it is contended, that though *not Socinian*, and although as Mr. Belsham admits, “he would, to the latest day of his life, have started from the imputation with horror;” that is, although he would have started with horror from the idea of admitting, or being supposed to admit, the mere human nature of Christ,—yet he might be a UNITARIAN, (which shews the *very convenient* use of this title,) and that although no written expressions of his can be produced, which favour *Unitarianism*, yet his last THOUGHTS were undoubtedly *Unitarian*. And thus is rudely, violently, and falsely, pressed into the service

requires not the feelings which belong to the Clergy of the Establishment, to be disgusted with the disingenuous proceedings of *Unitarians*, with their

of the *worst form of the Socinian heresy*, the name of a man, who, it is admitted, would have started with horror from the imputation of a *Socinian* belief. In Mr. Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey, the reader will find all that can be urged on the Unitarian side of the question respecting Dr. Watts's opinions: and, in Mr. Palmer's Tract, entitled, *Dr. Watts no Socinian*, he will find the complete refutation of Mr. Belsham's arguments: and he will be the more confirmed in the admission of the completeness of that refutation, by the attempts which are made to answer it in the viiiith. vol. of the *Monthly Repository*; in which it appears, that, as in the case of Sir Isaac Newton, it is on the report made by a *Socinian* witness, of matter which cannot be produced, that the whole charge of Dr. Watts's Socinianism exclusively rests. A Mr. Baron was *told*, by a Mr. Haynes, (both zealous Unitarians,) that he (Mr. Haynes) had heard from Sir Isaac Newton, (what it does not appear that any other human being had ever heard from him,) expressions indicating a disbelief of our Lord's *pre-existence*. And Dr. Lardner was *told* by a Mr. Neal, (both zealous Unitarians likewise,) that he (Mr. Neal) had heard from Dr. Watts, expressions indicative of certain *Unitarian* (THOUGH ADMITTED TO BE ANTISOCINIAN) sentiments: and, yet farther, that he had heard these expressions from Dr. Watts, in the presence of his friends in the family in which he resided, who "were greatly concerned to hear him talk" thus, (Belsh. Mem. of Lindsey, p. 220.) and who yet, at the same time, it appears, *never heard* these conversations, as we find it admitted in *Month. Rep.* vol. viii. pp. 716. 721. More proofs, we are assured, also, we should have, but that the above named Unitarians burned the papers of Dr. Watts, which would have established the evidence of his Unitarianism. One paper has, fortunately, remained, of which Mr. Belsham quotes a part, omitting *that* part of it which proves Dr. Watts to be the direct opposite of that which he labours to represent him.

But, there is something *still* more indefensible in the treatment of Dr. Watts, which remains to be noticed. It is well known, that a collection of hymns, by Dr. Watts, for the use of children, had obtained the most widely extended circulation, in all schools, and places of instruction for the young. These hymns, it is also well known, are calculated to convey, to the young mind, the *strictest* notions of *Orthodox* Christianity.

false pretences as to the extent of their numbers, their unfounded association of distinguished names, and their dishonest use of an equivocal appellation.

They, who have dived into Dr. Watts's last *thoughts*, and had discovered the secret, which Dr. Watts had so carefully concealed from all the world beside, (and indeed, as Mr. Belsham seems to say, even from himself,) namely, that he was a *Socinian*, have thought it right, as he had not himself made any corresponding alteration in his hymns, to make such an alteration for him; and have accordingly *Socinianized* throughout those beautiful divine songs, which, until tainted by this foul contact, had breathed the purest spirit of Christian piety, regulated by Christian doctrine. Thus, Dr. Watts is now made to speak, from the mouths of children, in language, which takes from our blessed Saviour all those attributes, the habitual clothing him with which, in the young imagination, was the great object which he had laboured to effect. But this dishonest use of Watts's name, for the corruption of the infant mind, is not the only thing to be complained of. That alterations had been made in those hymns, was, I believe, generally announced, in the published collections that had undergone this change: at the same time, that, from the intimation that the variations were but slight, and from the ignorance of the greater number of purchasers, (who, finding Dr. Watts's name annexed, would still receive them under the authority of that name,) the notice of the change was not likely to oppose any very material impediment, to the influential operation of the name of Watts appearing on the title page of the collection. Still, however, it might be *said*, that notice was given, that the hymns were altered: and again, it might be pretended, as in the case of Archbishop Newcome, that justice demanded, that acknowledgment should be made, openly, in the title page, of the author of the original work, from which this altered publication was principally derived. Let all this weigh, as so many words, to those, whom mere words content. They, who seek something beyond sounds, may not feel perfect satisfaction. At all events, it must be admitted, that common honesty demanded, that it should be announced, not only that alterations were made, but *by whom* they were made, by what denomination of sect, in order that the public might be fairly apprised of the character of those alterations. This, however, it is manifest, would have defeated the object. But, to pass this over, what will be said to the following fact? I have this moment lying before me, a printed copy of a collection of the hymns with

The Unitarian boast of the progress of their cause in Ireland, is, as we have seen, completely put down by the plain fact, that *not a single Unitarian con-*

this title page:—"DR. WATTS'S Divine and Moral Songs for Children: revised and altered so as to render them of general use: To which are added a short Catechism and Prayers. By MRS. TRIMMER." Now, that Mrs. Trimmer was a decided Trinitarian, in the strictest sense of the word; and that her opinions were in complete unison with the doctrines of the established church, is known to all who have the least acquaintance with her history and writings. The general notoriety on this head will be found to be fully verified by authentic details at pp. 91, 120, 152, 241. of the first volume of the *Account of her Life, &c.* lately published. The page last specified, indeed, evinces her habitual horror of the Socinian or Unitarian opinions. "I am grieved to see, by the Reviews, that Unitarian books multiply continually. *I am afraid that poison spreads itself. Oh! that I could furnish an antidote to it.* Lord Jesus, convinced as I am of Thy Divinity, I am zealous to maintain it, &c." This is the writer, to whom the adaptation of Dr. Watts's Hymns to general use is ascribed, together with a short catechism and prayers; all these, at the same time, executed by a Socinian pen; every sentiment which savoured of those great Christian doctrines, which both Dr. Watts and Mrs. Trimmer deemed essential to Christianity, carefully expunged; and every artful insinuation, of what, both these writers would have viewed with abhorrence, as tending to supplant those doctrines, fraudulently introduced. I shall give a single specimen in one of the doxologies.

"To God the Father, God the Son,
And God the Spirit, Three in One;
Be honour, praise and glory given,
By all on earth, and all in heaven."

Dr. Watts's.

The Socinian equivalent of this doxology ascribed to Mrs. Trimmer, is as follows:

"Praise to our gracious God be given,
By all on earth and all heaven;
Here would we celebrate his love,
Until we join the host above."

With the like *fidelity*, the hymns at large are presented to the public. A Socinian catechism of a most extraordinary structure is annexed. And all given as the joint production of DR. WATTS and MRS. TRIMMER, *for the use of children.* It is

gregation exists throughout the island. Similar boasting, as to America, has been sent abroad through Unitarian magazines, pamphlets and ser-

obvious, that the whole range of names, which the last century presents, could have furnished none, by which, free access to the nursery and the school-room, could have been so readily and so extensively procured, as the very two names which have been here falsely assumed. That of Mrs. Trimmer especially, (whatever special pleading there may be about the former, on the ground of a pretended change of opinions) must be admitted to be a base and deliberate *fraud*:—a fraud practised upon the parent, to gain admission within his doors, under a false name, in order to corrupt the mind and heart of his child : kidnapping of the most atrocious description, by which is stolen away, not the person, but the immortal soul of the infant. Such are Unitarian practices. Such are the fruits of a system, founded in the adulteration of scripture truth. They, who have falsified the word of God, cannot be expected to deal truly by the word of man. Deceptive titles, unfounded assertions, and false quotations, we have been familiarized with, as we have advanced in our acquaintance with Unitarians and their writings. But the reader could scarcely have been prepared, for a fabrication, so unprincipled, and treacherous, as this. I shall dwell upon it no longer. DR. CLARKE'S *Book of Common Prayer*: DR. WATTS'S *Divine and Moral Songs*: the same *revised and altered* by MRS. TRIMMER: and ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME'S *Version of the New Testament*,—are all standing monuments of the truth and fair dealing of modern Unitarianism: and the names of Newton, Locke, Clarke, and Watts, illustrious remembrancers of the respect, which its professors manifest for the true characters of the dead.

The bearing of the observation, in Dr. Bruce's letter, relative to the "American Correspondence," deserves to be understood, as it tends to give still farther insight into the *management* of Unitarian concerns. A splendid account had been sent abroad, through Unitarian publications, in these countries, of the rapid and extensive progress of Unitarianism in America. The Rev. Francis Parkman, a congregational minister of Boston, in a well written communication to the principal publisher of this account, gave it a direct and unqualified contradiction, disclaiming Unitarianism for America, as decisively, as Dr. Bruce has done for Ireland: and in terms still more emphatical. This gentleman, though in friendly intercourse with the leading Unitarians of England, and, equally with them, removed from

mons; but that this is nearly as unfounded as the former, there is good reason to think, from the authenticated contradictions which have reached these

all connexion with the Episcopal church, concludes his letter on the above subject with these words:—"I only wished to show, as I trust I have done without offence, that in Boston, in New England, and in America at large, WE ARE NOT, and permit me to add, *as long as we study the scriptures*, I believe WE SHALL NOT become converts to your NEW DOCTRINE." (Monthly Rep. vol. vii. p. 265.) The reply made to this, was, that the writer mistook altogether the meaning of the word UNITARIAN: that it did *not* mean the same as HUMANITARIAN, (such as Dr. Priestley, Mr. Belsham, &c.) but that it extended to all who were NOT Trinitarians; and therefore included (with this exception) those who *oppose* the doctrine of the *simple humanity* of Christ, as well as those who maintained it: and, to wind up all, comically enough, assured this reverend gentleman, that he was *himself* AN UNITARIAN *without knowing it*. The American Correspondent had declared, for himself, and those of his brethren, who might be supposed to approach nearest to UNITARIANS, that they, "holding high and exalted views of the personal mediation of Christ, resting on the merits of his atonement, his cross and passion, and zealous to pay the honour due to his name, would, consequently, be very unwilling to be confounded with the followers of Dr. Priestley." (ibid. p. 201.) But, being now assured, that *none* of these things stood in the way of their taking the name which was proffered to them; that, provided they were *not* Trinitarians, they were Unitarians; found, all of a sudden, that he and several of his brethren, were, as his English Correspondent had pronounced, UNITARIANS, *without knowing it*. They could not travel to the name, but the name had travelled to them, and therefore, in a letter sent to the Editor of the Unitarian Magazine, (with the express condition, by the way, that it should *not* be published, and which the Editor *accordingly* published without delay,) he apologizes for having spoken so strongly against Unitarians, now that he finds, that Unitarians may hold opinions directly *opposite* to those, which characterize the followers of Priestley. And thus, Unitarianism is now said to flourish in America; where, in the true sense of the word, as it is applied by the modern Socinians, it appears, that there are scarcely any Unitarians to be found. They, who would wish to see the most curious specimen of a contrivance, whereby may be enlisted into a class, a multitude of persons, by whom that class is directly opposed, will be not a little amused,

countries from America, as well as from the confessions since made upon this head by the Unitarians themselves. To Great Britain alone, the success of the Unitarian cause, to whatever that success may amount, is exclusively confined. And the appearance of progress, which is ostentatiously held out within this range, may, after all, be more justly

by tracing the history of this transaction to which I have here alluded, through pp. 198—201, 264, 265, 498—501, of vol. vii. and p. 478—480, of vol. viii. of the *Monthly Repository*.

Some very interesting information, concerning the endeavours to introduce Unitarianism, (that is modern Socinianism,) into America, and the bad success of those endeavours, will be found in an Extract from the *Panoplist* of Dr. Morse, entitled *Socinianism Unmasked*, which has lately been published in London. This work was occasioned by Mr. Belsham's unfounded representation of the progress of Unitarianism in America, and, besides much valuable matter upon the immediate subject, it contains some curious facts concerning Dr. Priestley whilst in that country. We learn from it, that the exercise of Dr. Priestley's ministry in the United States, was attended with scarcely any effect: and, we are put in possession of an extraordinary observation, made by him, in a letter to Mr. Lindsey, concerning Mr. Jefferson, of whom he uses these words: "He is generally considered as an unbeliever: if so, however, HE CANNOT BE FAR FROM US." (pp. 41. 47.) It appears also, from this pamphlet, that our English Unitarians have been active, at least, in putting forward their publications in America: and that, among these, their *New Version* is included. It is matter of satisfaction, to find, that works of another description, and which it is hoped, will counteract the mischief, have found their way into that country, without the efforts of a party. —The writings of Dr. Middleton, and Mr. Wardlaw, are there in extensive circulation: and it is nearly three years, since I received from Mr. Eastburn, of New York, a remarkably well printed copy of the third edition of this work, which that gentleman had of his own motion published in that city. Upon the whole, it is to be hoped, that America will remain, as Ireland has done, free from the taint of this most unchristian heresy: and, that however liberal the heads of this heresy may be, in bestowing the title of Unitarian, like the honorary one of LL. D. in both countries, it will be long before they find any real graduates of the school of Belsham and Gilchrist, in either.

considered as an illusion, growing from the noise and bustle of a few, than as marking a real extension of the numbers of the sect. The reports of such extension, with which their monthly magazines are stuffed, are most of them manifest exaggerations: and some of them are absolutely ludicrous. We have not merely clubs, and speeches, and dinner meetings and toasts, to promote and celebrate the spread of the Unitarian cause, and *ladies* assisting at these seemly celebrations, but we have, in their monthly enumeration of Unitarian congregations, accounts of some, composed of a number of individuals so scanty, that, to call the assemblage a *congregation*, is an application of the term altogether ridiculous. We have even, on one occasion, the exulting detail of a *single individual*,* determining to raise a temple to the Unitarian worship; and actually erecting himself into a Unitarian congregation; contriving, at the same time, to satisfy literally the scripture phrase of "*two or three assembled together*," by borrowing, from a distance, the attend-

* The account of this transaction will be found at p. 518, of vol. ix. of the Monthly Repository. It is given by the solitary agent, in this transaction, himself. Southampton, no very small town, is the place, where he could not find a *single* Unitarian in the town beside himself: notwithstanding which, he resolved upon a Unitarian "temple," and a Unitarian congregation.—The two Unitarians, whom he drew to him, one from Southen and another from Rumsey, made him feel comfortable, however, on the latter point; because, he "recollected the encouragement of our great Master, that 'where TWO OR THREE are gathered together' in support of his cause, he has promised his assistance." This gentleman has, it must be confessed, shown greater honesty, in his quotation from the gospel, than many Unitarian teachers are used to do, who are attended by larger congregations. He knew, that in the true sense of the word, *his* two or three could not be said to be gathered together *in the name of Christ*, (*two or three are gathered together IN MY NAME*) and, therefore, that part of our Lord's words he very properly omitted.

ance of *two other* Unitarians, for the occasion of the meeting.

The grand object of the Unitarians, at present, is *proselytism*. The encrease of their numbers, whether that encrease be real or apparent, whether it be an extension of the principle, or only of the name, is now the point, to which all their exertions are directed. The apparent, they think, will work the real. And for this purpose, nothing could be better contrived, than the equivocal application of the title,* which they have assumed. To those, who

* The degree, to which, the equivocation, in the use of this title, has been carried, may be best understood, from a controversy, which has lately arisen among the Unitarians themselves; and which is to be found in the tenth volume of their *Monthly Repository*, (the volume for the year 1815,) at pages 226, 278, 354, 355, 416, 475, 479, 483, 552, 554, 555, 585, 590, 637, 638, 639, 709, 710, 743, 744, 745. I have been thus particular, in tracing out the whole field of the controversy, because nothing can more clearly manifest the true character and designs of the sect, than this domestic discussion which has taken place within its pale. And, I can assure the reader, who is desirous to ascertain the genuine objects of modern Unitarians, that, in this view, he will find himself fully compensated, for his trouble, in travelling through the entire range, which I have here marked out for his inspection. Some extracts from the more important parts of this controversy I shall here subjoin.

Mr. Belsham, at page 34 of his *Letters to the Bishop of London*, (intended as a reply to certain observations upon Unitarianism, contained in one of the most luminous, comprehensive, and dignified pastoral discourses, that have at any time issued from the Episcopal chair,) had asserted for the UNITARIANS, that they “*reject the doctrine of the Trinity, of the creation of the Universe by Jesus Christ, of the incarnation, of the atonement, of original sin, and other popular doctrines connected with these.*”—To this CREED, (of special *disbelief*,) laid down for UNITARIANS, by Mr. Belsham, it was immediately objected, on the part of that body at large, that, their fundamental principle being, “that there is only one God, the Father,” they are grossly misrepresented by Mr. Belsham, in fastening upon them a *creed*, expressing a rejection of doctrines, *every one of which, except that of the Trinity*, is received by some among them: in

are to be initiated, the term *Unitarian* is presented, as merely denoting all who are *not Trinitarian*; that is, as these gentlemen again explain this expression,

somuch "that, if from the body of Unitarians were to be excluded, all those, who do not believe according to Mr. Belsham's negative creed, he would be left in a very inconsiderable minority." The advocate, who thus maintained the unrestricted principle of Unitarianism, and whose education and habits of science gave him a decided superiority in precision and reasoning over the opponent with whom he had to contend, proceeds very justly to demand,—“why should we, who object to the creeds of our brother Christians, make ourselves exclusive creeds?” And, at the same time that he fully admits Mr. Belsham's absolute right to state *his own* creed, he totally denies his right to state it *as the creed of Unitarians*: and finally, in the name of the *Unitarian body*, “protests against such an imposition of articles of faith,” as being both unauthorized and unfounded. Mr. Belsham, in reply, condemns the vague use of the word Unitarian in modern practice; it being employed (as he says) to express every class of religionists from the Athanasian down to the Mahometan: and, assuming the high tone of authority, and fortifying himself by the sanction of Lardner, Priestley and Lindsey, without condescending to reason upon the subject, he declares his *determination* to apply the term, in no other, than in the restricted sense, which he had already ascribed to it. This authoritative style of Mr. Belsham is met by his spirited opponent, as might be expected, with much indignation. After pointing out, that the consequence of such usurpation of authority, on the part of Mr. Belsham, must be, that others would in like manner, from time to time, with equal right, impose new articles of belief, until, at last, the Unitarian, instead of having one simple article of belief, would be lost in the complication of his own creed; he concludes with declaring, that, if to be a Unitarian, it is necessary to adopt the creed laid down by Mr. Belsham, he must give up his pretensions to be called by that name; and hints, with much emphasis, that in this act he would be very far from being singular. Mr. Belsham, in reply, still stands upon the high ground of “*sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas* :” contends for the propriety of the restricted sense; abuses the Arians; and thinks it best, that there should be a separation of the staunch followers of *his* opinions, from the other classes of Unitarians; for that, otherwise, the conducting Society may send out missionaries of opposite complexions,

not Athanasian. To all, then, who do not receive the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is laid down in the Athanasian creed, the title of *Unitarian* is, in the

who may defeat each other's views and doctrines. It is again pressed upon Mr. Belsham, that he has no right to require the adoption of *his* creed, which is eminently defective in important points of christian belief; that the rejection of certain doctrines, which is required by Mr. Belsham, in a Unitarian, is not requisite to qualify for that denomination: but that many, who hold those doctrines, are as well entitled to the name, as Mr. Belsham himself. Mr. Belsham, now, *calmly* rejoins, that he merely meant to give his *definition* of Unitarian; that others were at equal liberty to give theirs: and so begs leave to withdraw from the contest. His opponent, however, justly rebukes him for confounding "definition" with "assertion:" and concludes with stating, that, at all events, it is requisite for him to announce, that he is not of *that* class of Unitarians to which Mr. Belsham belongs; for that he approaches much nearer to the Arians, whom Mr. B. had abused, than he does to Mr. Belsham himself; with whom he never can concur in his "opinions of the office and character of our Saviour."—Indeed, these last words distinguish the writer, who uses them, very widely from Unitarians of Mr. Belsham's class. *The very sound of them is christian.* [But this same writer had, already, most honourably for himself, drawn a broad line of distinction between himself and such Unitarians as Mr. Belsham, in what he had stated on the subject of Atonement in the same volume of the Monthly Repository: and which, there is good reason to think, had the effect of deterring the conductors of that journal from carrying forward the discussion on that subject, although, as I have before had occasion to observe, (see page 285 of this volume,) it was announced, that this important subject was to receive a lengthened and elaborate investigation in the succeeding numbers of the Journal. It was found prudent very soon to desist. It was discovered to be a *dangerous* discussion.

Whilst this controversy was going forward, another started up, in consequence of the apprehension excited, lest Mr. Belsham's attempt to narrow the meaning of the term Unitarian, should injure the good cause. The term, it was allowed on all hands, had been used as a *generic* name, including various classes, Arians, Socinians, Sabellians, and, if not Calvinists, yet such as held even the doctrine of atonement in a qualified sense; all in short who were *not* decided Trinitarians. It was contended, that it would be wise to continue it in this applica-

first instance, to be applied : and all such, of course, are hailed as brethren, and admitted within the pale of this honourable denomination. Then, as, from

tion, for that, hereby, those who differed from the believers in the simple humanity, being brought into contact with them, would, if these latter were not too hasty in urging matters forward, be *drawn* into the final adoption of their opinions. The term UNITARIAN, in short, is recommended to be continued, as it had been used, as a decoy ; for which, from its general, and simple, and uninvincible application, it seemed so admirably fitted. It is emphatically urged, that it is quite *too soon* for the Unitarians to split into parties ; that “ they are too much like a rope of sand already ; ” and that, however they may differ in their opinions, they must hold together *as if* they agreed in one system, till “ they have by union cleared the world of the Trinitarian doctrine.” At the same time, in order to satisfy such as were desirous of a *term* to distinguish those who hold the simple humanity of Christ, various titles are in succession proposed and rejected. Socinian, Humanitarian, Priestleyan, have each their advocates. Thus, it was supposed, that all parties might be satisfied : Unitarian implying the general association, and the other terms indicating the particular creed.

But, in the desire to reconcile the contending parties, it was forgotten by the persons who proposed this plan of conciliation, that the whole value of the name Unitarian would by this means be lost : and, accordingly, a veteran, who saw his way more clearly than the rest, recommends, that no such distinction of names should be at all admitted ; but that the same word Unitarian should be applied to the entire aggregate, comprehending the various classes of dissentients from the doctrine of the Trinity, and also be used as the distinctive denomination for that particular class which rests on the simple humanity of Christ. To this the obvious objection was made, that the name of the entire genus cannot well designate exclusively any *one* of those species, to *all* of which it *equally* extends. This gentleman replies, that this is a peculiar case : that the name, which designates *this* species best, is the very name which belongs to it in common with all the others : and that, therefore, the *generic* name is here the fittest for the *specific* appellation. This must be admitted to be very new logic : but, at the same time, it is, undoubtedly, very old management. The ambiguity, (which is the primary object,) is hereby preserved : since the same term can now be extended to the many, or appropriated to the few, as occasion may require. The gentleman, who proposed this

the spirit of party, the force of association, the influence of flattery, persuasion, and other co-operating causes, the initiated is led to make still farther

novel mode of conciliation, saw that the cause was in danger. There was reason to apprehend, that those links, which now bound together so many different classes firmly *against* ATHANASIUS, and which might ultimately draw them *to* Mr. Belsham, would by the great eagerness of this gentleman to place himself at the head of the Sect, be prematurely broken. He had, openly, and rashly, affirmed, that none could be considered as UNITARIANS, who did not accept his creed. He had, in other words, contended, that the name must be confined to one specific class; and he had, therefore, as the other classes were not yet prepared to allow themselves to be melted down into this one, and to receive him as their head, thrown off their co-operation, and reduced the boasted numbers of the Unitarian body to a contemptible few. How was this to be remedied? The name, Mr. Belsham contended, however generic it might have been hitherto considered, must be appropriated to the species. The conciliator replies, the generic name may still continue as such. But, whilst it is the true name for the *genus*, it is, on the same principle, best fitted to *particularize* this one *species*. And thus, he both satisfies Mr. Belsham, by making it the *proper* appellation for *all who think with him*: and gives content to those of the general denomination, who will not accept Mr. Belsham's creed, by continuing it as the generic name for all who do not think with ATHANASIUS.

The ingenuity, by which this professed moderator of the contending parties, who had solely the interests of one in view, has contrived to reconcile two things apparently contradictory, can only be conceived by reading the letters of Mr. Aspland, in this controversy. The grand point, however, is now effected. Matters are again settled as before: and the term Unitarian is now, for all the purposes of proselytism, at the same time restrictive and comprehensive, to any degree, that the managers of the term may require. In truth, I cannot better represent the nature of this term, as it is now used, than by an illustration, which there is undoubtedly one Unitarian who will comprehend; but that, a Unitarian far removed from the class, to which Mr. Belsham would confine the name; as he has proved, in the very controversy, to which I have referred. It will be readily understood, and for obvious reasons, that I mean Mr. Frend. The illustration to which I allude, is derived from the lunar shadow: which, if the term be restricted to the direct

advances, the entire scheme is gradually unfolded, and embraced; and the progressive convert is finally introduced into those interior regions, where Unitarians of full grown stature, (such as Mr. Belsham and Mr. Gilchrist,) properly reside; not indeed, to what, with the Christian, may be deemed analogous to the “*secretosque pios*” of the poet; but to mansions separated by a wide gulph from all that be-

cone, sends its darkening influence but to a small portion of the earth’s surface: but, if the expression be conceived to extend to the penumbral space, spreads its partial obscuration to a comparatively wide space indeed. In like manner, to the Unitarian, in Mr. Belsham’s more contracted use of the appellation, to whom the whole sun of righteousness is eclipsed, the range is proportionally contracted: But they, to whom, in a greater latitude of the term, different degrees of encreasing illumination are transmitted, spread over a wider extent, and with the benefit of a progressively encreasing irradiation, until having passed the boundaries of partial obscuration, they emerge into bright and open day.

It ought to be observed, that in the course of this controversial discussion, among the various names suggested, for the class of Unitarians which forms the true nucleus of the body, and which is, in truth, the class to which the whole apparatus is adapted, I mean the class of such persons as Mr. Belsham and Mr. Gilchrist, the most adequate seems one, which Mr. Aspland has adverted to, at p. 642 of the volume referred to—viz. Budneians. This class of Socinians seems, in all general principles, to correspond, most exactly with Mr. Belsham’s Unitarians. Possibly, however, in minuter matters, they had not travelled sufficiently far. No objection, however, can possibly lie against the title of Priestleyan. And for the sake of clearness, I shall, in all future observations which I may be compelled to bestow upon this sect, designate them by no other. Unitarian, it is manifest by their own confession, no more discriminates the peculiar class which is the subject of our present remarks, than the word *Christian* discriminates any of the particular description of the believers, who call themselves after the name of Christ. I have, it will be allowed, sufficiently shown my desire to comply with their wishes, so far as a name was concerned, in having used it so long without scruple:—but now, that they have confessed the dishonest use they mean to make of it, I can use it no longer.

longs to Christianity. Thus we see, that it is not under the influence of the Papacy only, that the principle of Jesuitism,—that of an artful and elastic accommodation, joined with the careful separation of esoteric and exoteric—is called into active operation at the present day. By such means, the judicious application of a *name*, may be employed, to give a real encrease to the numbers of the sect. But, at all events, its apparent dimensions are widely dilated, by the extent of a signification, which is made to spread over all, that lies between the boundaries, of the strictest Trinitarianism, and of that open and ostentatious Deism, which rejects even the name of Christianity. With the Deist of this description, the *Unitarian* prudently disclaims alliance; whilst, to the opponents of revelation, who carry their faculties more discreetly, he affords a convenient shelter. And thus, by the contrivance of a name, a sect, which, in its true and real character, is, by the confession of its warmest friends,*

* “We are a sect few in number, unfashionable, unpopular, despised, hated, calumniated, every where spoken against,” &c. Letter to the Bishop of London, by T. Belsham, p. 48.—This, of course, must be applied only to the genuine Unitarians, those of Mr. Belsham’s own class, to whom he wishes to appropriate the name, as we have seen in the preceding note. For we know how magniloquently the same writer has enlarged upon the numbers, and weight, and consequence, and encreased and encreasing respectability of Unitarians, in numerous other passages of his writings. It was, however, *convenient*, here, to use, in plaintive accents, a language, which, although contradicted in terms by the same writer, in other places, is undoubtedly the truth. How great are the advantages of a well chosen name! Mr. Aspland, in his warm recommendation of the continuance of the use of the word Unitarian, in that ambiguous sense, in which it had already done so much good to the cause, very justly observes, from Dr. South, that “the generality of mankind is *wholly* and *absolutely* governed by *words* and *names*,” and that “he, who will set up for a skilful manager of the rabble, *so long as they have but ears to hear*, needs never enquire

small and despised; and whose principles are equally offensive to sober piety and to sound intellect, but above all diametrically opposed to the Christian Scriptures, is made to appear (if we except the Trinitarian worshipper) co-extensive with the Christian name. Indeed, it might be a question, whether, as the Trinitarian is pronounced to be a polytheist, and therefore cannot properly be admitted within the pale of Christianity, the title CHRISTIAN might not be *appropriated* to those, who now call themselves *Unitarians*: and thus, they, who, in the true sense of the phrase, *deny Christ*, be pronounced the only persons, who deserve to be *called after his name*.

But, beside the insidious use of a deceptive denomination, the powerful engines of *Societies* and *Missions*, are also now brought into action. The efficacy of these, so abundantly evinced in the propagation of Methodism, the promoters of this new system are desirous to employ in the extension of theirs. At the late establishment of their general association in Scotland, they have announced the discovery,* that “Union is strength.” This disco-

whether they have any understanding whereby to judge: but with two or three popular empty words, well tuned and humoured, may whistle them backwards and forwards, upwards and downwards, till he is weary; and get upon their backs when he is so.” Month. Rep. vol. x. p. 481.—And what does Mr. Aspland deduce from all this? Why, neither more nor less than this—that the name Unitarian must never be given up; but all possible changes rung upon it, let the opinions of those who bear that name, be ever so various and contradictory.

* See the account of the General Association of Unitarians in Scotland, at p. 390 of vol. x. of the Monthly Repository. The consolidation of force is the grand object. Every man to his post. This is the grand discovery of modern days for the subversion of Establishments, of whatever aspect, civil or religious. An extended organization, a compacting discipline, a rapid communication, and a combined movement: all this is

very had been made and acted upon before, with considerable energy, both in Great Britain and Ireland, for the purpose of relieving the inhabitants of these free countries from the pressure of the British constitution. Societies are now, as then, to be formed and combined together, in one general concert, but for a different object, that of banishing, not the name indeed, but the reality of Christ's religion, out of a Christian land. It remains, at the same time, to be submitted to experiment, how far such an organized system will be employed, in repaying to the constitution, what it may succeed in

said to be effective for the diffusion of *religious truth*. Whether it be effective for this purpose or not, there are purposes, which it is admirably fitted to accomplish. "UNION IS STRENGTH." Undoubtedly. Acts of Parliament are not wanting to augment its force. The Unitarians are now labouring to prove, that they needed not that aid, which the Legislature has lately, with so much magnanimity, bestowed upon them. The uses to be made of this consolidation of strength are now beginning to unfold themselves. The Unitarian Magazine for April of the present year, conveys a pretty significant hint of the value of the argument, to be derived from numbers united in a common cause. There indeed we find the circle widened. That of Unitarianism was felt to be too contracted, for the object to be embraced; which is neither more nor less, than the Abolition of the Establishment. For this, it is deemed requisite to combine into one grand phalanx the whole body of the Dissenters, of whatever denomination. Against the assaults of this mighty column, it is confidently asserted that the old bulwarks of the constitution must give way. The Establishment is declared to be a grievance no longer to be borne. And the Dissenters are pronounced to have now attained such strength from their *numbers*, that it requires but one combined effort to throw off the antiquated encumbrance. *Petition* indeed, is for form-sake mentioned; and the *peculiar mode* of raising the revenues of the Church adverted to; but intimidation by force are the means pointed out; and the abolition of the Establishment the end proposed, "UNION IS STRENGTH." AND THE ESTABLISHMENT MUST FALL. *Delenda est Carthago*. See Monthly Repository, vol. xi. p. 207.

taking from the religion, of the country. The law has recently bestowed increased powers upon the Unitarian: it is to be presumed, that he will not employ these increased powers to reduce the strength of the law, however he may be disposed to employ them for the subversion of the national religion. At the same time it should always be carefully remembered, by those whom these matters most concern, that one grand cause of hostility to the *Establishment*, arises out of the fact of its forming a *part of the Constitution*.

But, again, not only is the face of the land to be covered with societies, bound together in one firm league; but missionaries are to be sent forth in all directions, to spread the opinions of this new sect. Here indeed is an extraordinary state of things. Missionaries to *teach* the truths of Christianity, we are well acquainted with: but Missionaries to *un-teach* them, are of a description rather unusual. Missionaries there have been, who have encountered much for the *love of Christ*: but that missionaries, *calling* themselves *Christian*, should go abroad to work the *rejection of his name*, is a singularity indeed. It is impossible to behold this portentous retroversion of religious zeal, without being recalled to the recollection of that first great mission, on which our Lord sent his disciples. We, there, see the devoted followers of Christ, commissioned by him to go forth, and teach all nations, *baptizing them in the name of the Father AND of the Son AND of the Holy Ghost*. Here we see the followers of a different Lord, going forth to inculcate, as the one great maxim, which alone is worthy to be taught, that *there is no Son and no Holy Ghost*. *There* we see the disciples of our blessed master, receiving directions from him, to preach that gospel, which *he* had given them. *Here* we see the messengers

of another master, directed to carry with them a *false gospel*, which, whilst it bears the name, shall more effectually subvert the doctrines, of the true gospel of Christ. *There*, also, we find an authority conferred, to announce to mankind the gracious tidings of a *Redeemer*, through whom every one that *believeth shall be saved*. But, *here*, we find teachers, directed to guard all against the danger of *belief*; and to enforce emphatically, as the most important truth, that *he alone shall be saved who believeth not*.

When it is considered, that the modern Socinian, (who calls himself Unitarian,) is, under the name of Christian, the decided enemy of Christianity; and, under the guise of a translator of the New Testament, a deliberate falsifier of the Gospel, it may appear hardly necessary to offer an excuse, for entering at any length however great into controversy, with persons, who would thus clandestinely steal from the Christian all that forms his consolation and his hope. But, that in these volumes, whose immediate subject is the doctrine of Atonement, this controversy should have been carried in the direction and to the extent to which it has travelled, may not unreasonably appear to demand explanation. It will be recollected by those, who are acquainted with the writings of Dr. Priestley, and his fellow labourers of that day, that the doctrine of the Atonement was that which they conceived to be the vitally distinguishing doctrine of the orthodox system: and, on looking back to page 69—71 of the first volume of this work, it will be seen, that against this doctrine especially, as the foundation of all that he was pleased to call the corruptions of Christianity, the father of modern Socinianism, directed his most strenuous and persevering exertions. In this view of the case, the Author of these volumes was originally induced to engage in the vindication of this important doctrine, and in the discussion of the various objections, which, by the united industry of Dr. Priestley and other Socinians, had been collected against it: naturally expecting that if he must be engaged in farther controversy with the followers of Priestley, it would be upon that ground which had thus been chosen by themselves. The matter, however, turns up differently. The question of Atonement is no longer made the subject of investigation by the modern Socinians: and now, after a lapse of fifteen years from the first publication of this work, it is openly (and it may be said, officially,) announced, that the prosecution of the controversy upon this doctrine is to be relinquished. For this, two reasons are assigned: one, affecting the nature of the work, by which I had endeavoured to maintain the doctrine; and the other affecting the doctrine itself. The former, as it is stated by Mr. Belsham, the present champion of Socinianism, and repeated by his admirers, is, that it must be unnecessary at this time of day to prove, that the cause of Cain's rejection was not his having "offered

a vegetable instead of an animal," (which is, of course, the whole, that this discerning writer could discover; as bearing upon the question of Atonement, in the volumes of this work that have been hitherto published;) and the latter is, that the fact of the mere humanity of Christ being (as it is modestly assumed) completely established, the received doctrine of the Atonement is thereby at once virtually overturned. Thus, we see, the doctrine of the Atonement, and the arguments which have been urged in its defence, are fairly run away from: and the various objections, which had been so laboriously marshalled against that doctrine, by the ingenuity of former Socinians, totally abandoned to their fate. The opponent of the doctrine of the Atonement having found it convenient thus to retire from the advanced position, and to direct his attacks against the doctrine from a more distant quarter, taking his stand upon the ground of the mere humanity of our Lord; thither, of course, the defender of the doctrine is obliged to follow, and finds himself compelled to carry on the combat on the new ground which the adversary has selected.

The contrivance, it has been seen, by which the modern Socinian deems it most expedient to maintain his extravagant notions concerning our Lord's humanity, is the propagation of a false gospel. To the exposure of this false gospel the attention of the author of these volumes has been consequently directed. And although the endeavour to accomplish this object has led to a considerable extension of the work, yet he trusts, that, in the nature of the case and the great importance of the subject, the candid and christian reader will discover his apology. Perhaps, indeed, when well considered, it is not so much for the extent to which he has pushed his exposure of the modern Socinians and their Version, that he needs excuse, as for his not having carried it much farther. He is happy, however, to have it in his power to say, that, in addition to what has been advanced in these sheets, enough (to honest and informed readers perhaps more than enough,) has been done by the several distinguished writers whom he has occasionally named throughout the preceding Supplement, to put down the recent attempts, which have been made by the modern Socinians, in support of their system, through the medium of a falsified New Testament. To those several writers, especially to the Bishop of St. David's, Dr. Nares, Dr. Middleton, Dr. Laurence, Mr. Veysie, and Mr. Wardlaw, he refers the reader for the filling up what these pages have necessarily left untouched. To these writers there ought indeed to be added the name of Mr. Nolan, who, although he has not treated directly of the subject at issue with the Socinians, has thrown a most valuable light on what they have artfully contrived to draw into connexion with their object, by bringing Griesbach (whom they claim, though untruly, as a powerful auxiliary to their cause,) under strict examination, and subjecting his system of classification to a critical and searching scrutiny. The work upon the *Integrity of the Vulgate Greek text of the New Testament*, a work marked by characters of great industry, learning and sagacity, be the ultimate decision upon the momentous and difficult subject of which it treats what it may, has, besides the merit of yielding strong support to certain important texts of the New Testament, the additional merit of giving a salutary check to the too unqualified (I had almost said the vulgar) admiration of an eminent critic, which the wily Socinians of the day have not failed to turn to mischievous account. An accurate appreciation of the due value of that critic's labours, must be of the last advantage to biblical literature: such appreciation has not yet been obtained, and to its attainment Mr. Nolan's work cannot but materially conduce.

INDEX

OF THE

PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

A.

Abraham's intended sacrifice of Isaac—a singular resemblance to it in the *Mystical Sacrifice of the Phenicians*, i. 296—300.

AINCHMATA, or *sins of ignorance*, fully explained, i. 258—263—Opinion of the Rabbis concerning sins of this description, i. 203, 204.

Animal food not granted to man before the flood, i. 395, 405.

Apostolical Fathers—their references to various passages of the New Testament, ii. 214, 215, 218, 225, 231—the nature and objects of their writings, ii. 215, 216, 225, 231,—their silence respecting the first two chapters of St. Matthew falsely urged as an argument against the authenticity of those chapters, ii. 214, 231.

Articles (Thirty-nine)—reduced in number to *twenty-five* by Mr. Wesley; and those which are retained by him, materially altered, i. 123,—not to be subscribed unless by those who believe the doctrines which they propound, ii. 123, 125, 128, 129,—the bearing of the *Sixth Article* on the interpretation of the rest, ii. 123, 124.—Mr. Fellowes's unjustifiable notions of their meaning and obligation, ii. 123, 130—Dr. Paley, Mr. Gisborne, Dr. Powell, and the Bishop of Lincoln referred to upon their interpretation, ii. 125, 126.

Asiatic Researches—the *London Edition* of this work contains a *wicked fabrication* calculated to subvert *revelation*, ii. 63, 64.

Atonement, the received doctrine of, objected to on the ground that Christ's death was not a *propitiatory sacrifice*, i. 23.—Objection answered by texts of scripture describing it as such, i. 23, 169.—Objected, that the language in these texts is figurative, i. 24, 170, 188, 194.—Objection answered, i. 25, 26, 164, 196.—Leading arguments against the doctrine, urged with their

greatest force by Ben Mordecai, i. 195.—Levitical *atonement* said by B. Mordecai and Dr. Priestley to imply only ceremonial purification, i. 247, 253—the contrary shewn, i. 247, 253,—more minutely argued, i. 254, 268—Atonements in the Old Testament extended to the violations of *moral* law, and procured a real forgiveness, i. 27, 28, 263, 267—Objections against the doctrine, *unfairly* drawn from the expression, vicarious punishment, i. 268, 270—Arguments brought by Sykes and B. Mordecai against the doctrine, on the supposition of an implied *vicarious substitution*, i. 270—shown to have no weight against the *true* notion of atonement, i. 270, 278—*Christian* atonement described by the terms, *bearing sins*, &c. in such manner, as to convey the *propitiatory* and *vicarious* import more strongly than is expressed in *Mosaic*, i. 271, 272, 300, 301—inconsistency in the arguments urged on this head against the doctrine, i. 301—language of the New Testament more circumstantial and precise upon the nature of atonement, than that of the Old, i. 48, 49, ii. 46, 47—contended by Dr. Priestley, that no trace whatever of the doctrine is to be found either in the Old or New Testament, i. 358—refuted, i. 358, 362—the doctrine, why not as fully explained in the Gospels as in the Epistles, i. 360, 362, ii. 120—Doctrine of atonement does not sink our ideas of the divine *mercy*, i. 369, 372—opposition to the doctrine arising generally from what cause, i. 32—see *Redemption*.

B.

Bailly—maintains an extravagant antiquity of the *Indian Astronomy*, ii. 64, 65—followed by *Professor Playfair*, *ibid.*—confuted by *La Place*, ii. 65, 69—and by *Mr. Bentley*, ii. 68, 69.

Balguy's excellent argument to prove the *natural* insufficiency of repentance to procure forgiveness of sins, i. 71, 73, 164.

Barbauld, (Mrs.)—her admirable remarks on prayer, i. 106, 107—defender of public worship against Wakefield, i. 136—represents good works as giving a *claim of right* to divine acceptance, i. 136—a highly accomplished writer, i. 136, ii. 152.

Beattie, (Dr.)—his excellent confutation and exposure of *Hume*, ii. 87, 90, 94—pronounces the human invention of language to be impossible, i. 410.

Belsham, (Mr.)—rejects the notion of Christ's pre-existence, i. 54—refers to others for the proof, 54, 55—indulges in impious raillery on the subject of atonement, i. 132—has no fixed creed, i. 135, 136—explains the difference between *Unitarians* and *Socinians*, i. 117—argues in support of a *purgatory*, ii. 140, 146, 147—denies that any religious address should be offered to Christ, ii. 143—maintains, in opposition to the received no-

tion of the corruption of human nature, the preponderance of virtue over vice, ii. 141, 143—makes virtue *mechanism*, ii. 144, 146—overturns his own scheme of *merit*, ii. 144, 146—must on his own principles reject the notion of punishment altogether, ii. 146, 147—adopts the principle of *predestination*, ii. 146, 149—and the *fatalism* of the Stoic, ii. 148—inconsistently recommends gratitude to God, ii. 149—his new mode of reforming a sinner, ii. 149, 152—objects specially to *remorse* in the sinner, as a thing pernicious, ii. 150, 151—inconsistently calls upon the sinner to reform, whilst the principles which he advances go to prove the impossibility of reformation, ii. 151—adopts the unintelligible phraseology of the Illuminati, ii. 151—rejects the idea of *prayer*, and necessarily, ii. 153—objects to the Sabbatical observance, as forbidden by the Gospel, i. 68, ii. 154—considers it injurious to the cause of virtue, ii. 154—short view of Mr. B's. Christianity, ii. 154, 157—differs little from the deism of Lepaux, i. 134. ii. 157—Mr. B. *a moral teacher*, ii. 156, 157—but not a teacher of Christianity, ii. 156, 157—admits himself to be nearer to Infidelity than to Orthodoxy, ii. 159—guilty of a total want of charity in his judgment of the Clergy of the Established Church, ii. 159—arrogates exclusively the profession of a *pure* Christianity, ii. 161—complains of persecution, *ibid.*—his proof of this persecution, ii. 162—sufficiency of this proof considered, ii. 162, 166—asserts the Unitarian cause to be progressive, ii. 167—in what sense this can be allowed to be true, ii. 167, 168—Mr. B. prevented from advancing to Deism by his early instruction in sounder principles, ii. 171, 172—his assertion of the increase of the number of Unitarians borrows an appearance of truth from one circumstance, ii. 173—One most extraordinary and irrefragable proof of Mr. B's. assertion, ii. 173, 174—he admits Unitarianism to be hard to be understood, ii. 175—called on to account for the dissolution of the Academy of Hackney, i. 69, ii. 168, 175—admits and glories in the licentiousness of the system at Hackney, ii. 168, 169—explains how the Unitarians contrive to retain the Bible, ii. 176, 177—interprets like Lord Peter, ii. 177—enjoys an exclusive monopoly of the powers of reasoning, ii. 177, 181—exhibits singular proofs of this in a treatise on Logics, Metaphysics, and Morals, by a reference to which treatise his high claims are estimated, ii. 178, 181—classes the clergy of the establishment under the heads of impostors and bigots, ii. 181, 182—charges Doddridge with supporting from prejudice an erroneous and unscriptural system, ii. 183—refers for the proof of the truth of his tenets to other Commentators, ii. 183—has made a good selection for his purpose, ii. 183—why could not add Paine, ii. 184—why not Geddes, ii. 184, 185—exhibits a few specimens of his own cri-

ticism, ii. 185—convicts St. Paul of ignorance, ii. 185—sets him right, ii. 185, 186—commends Dr. Taylor's *Scripture Key*, reason why, i. 143, ii. 141—refers to Dr. Taylor, whose observations make against him, ii. 186, 187—compares Bonaparte to Jesus Christ, ii. 188, 189—has lately given a *new* digest of the Unitarian creed as touching the person of Christ, ii. 189, 190—shows that the teaching of our Lord and his Apostles is to be received with great caution and distrust, ii. 190, 191—expresses doubts as to the *moral character* of our Saviour, ii. 191, 192—said to be the author of an anonymous pamphlet of a contemptible description, ii. 236, 237—his strange remarks on John, v. 27, exposed, ii. 251, 252—his extraordinary reasoning on Luke, i. 35, exposed, ii. 257, 262—his gross falsification of Schleusner exposed, ii. 275—his extraordinary attempts at criticism and reasoning on John, ii. 19, and x. 17, exposed, ii. 275—his monstrous absurdities on the subject of *expiation for moral offences*, ii. 281, 282—ascribes *enigmatical* meanings to our Lord's discourses, ii. 293, 294—explains Christ's *descent from and ascent into heaven*, as meaning nothing either of coming from or going to heaven, ii. 295, 303—proves from Astronomy that there is *no heaven*, ii. 301—at the same time contends for Christ's *going into heaven*, ii. 302—exhibits a curious instance of his want of acquaintance with Greek, 320, 321—contends that the pre-existence of a *miser*, may as well be deduced from 2 Cor. viii. 9, as that of Christ, ii. 326, 328—easily disposes in his own manner of all the texts that declare our Lord's pre-existence, ii. 328, 329—compares the texts that support our Lord's pre-existence to the stars in the firmament, ii. 329—gives a curious specimen of his notions of Astronomy, ii. 329, 330—gives a curious specimen of his knowledge of the Greek language, ii. 331, 342—blunders in plain English as well as in Greek, ii. 333—his extraordinary and self-contradictory notion of a mere man having miraculous powers at his own option, ii. 372, 379—his singularly dishonest treatment of 1 Cor. xv. 38, exposed, ii. 402, 403—his monstrous treatment of the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and his strange jumble of all that relates to *Angels, Spirits, and Heaven*, ii. 407, 411—objects strongly to *Hierarchies* amongst angels, ii. 414—professes himself to be neither a *materialist* nor an *immaterialist*, ii. 416—says that his true position is in the *centre of oscillation*, ii. 417—manifestly ignorant of what the centre of oscillation means, ii. 417—pretends to retract his avowed opinions both on *Materialism* and the *Sabbath*, in order to make proselytes, ii. 417.

Ben Mordecai, (H. Taylor,) his letters written with acuteness, i. 99—his just views of the principle of *mediation*, i. 99—his scheme of Atonement, i. 16, 17—not free from a tincture of So-

cinian principles, i. 17, 138—different from that of Dr. Taylor of Norwich, i. 142—objects to the received doctrine of Atonement, its implication of the *divine implacability*, i. 17—answered on his own principles, 18, 20, 143, 147—objects without reason to Grotius, Stillingfleet and Clarke, i. 145—objects to the doctrine of atonement on the ground of a want of discoverable connexion between the means and the end, i. 19—answered, i. 19, 20, 153, 154—objects on the ground of the divine immutability, and of the texts which speak of man's *reconciliation to God*, i. 20, 22, 151—answered, i. 21, 23, 155, 158—denies that the paschal lamb is referred to in calling Jesus the lamb of God, i. 164—refuted, i. 164, 167—endeavours to prove that the word *ιασμος* does not support the idea of *propitiation*, i. 167—shown to be mistaken, i. 167, 168, 185, 186—his argument from the word *καταλλαγή* shown to be inconclusive, i. 185, 186—endeavours to prove that the phrase *for us*, cannot mean *in our stead*, i. 189—his argument shown to be erroneous, i. 189, 192, ii. 186—attempts to deprive the *Levitical* atonement of all *propitiatory* import, and to represent it but as a ceremonial purification, i. 253—this notion refuted, i. 249, 253—his arguments against the doctrine of atonement on the supposition of its implying the absurdity of a vicarious substitution, stated and answered, i. 270, 278—his attempt to do away the force of the expression, *bearing sins*, examined and refuted, i. 313, 358—his theory of *Sacrifice*, i. 386—shown to be erroneous, i. 35, 393, 394.

Benson, (Dr.) admits that *bearing sins* signifies *suffering the penalty due to them*, i. 349, 350—his criticism on the word *αναφερο* examined and refuted, i. 354, 356.

Blaney, (Dr.) not consistent, i. 345, 346.

Bolingbroke supplies, without intending it, a good argument against certain mistaken views of the Mosaic institution, i. 178, 179—a short review of his character, and of his attempts to overturn Revelation, ii. 74, 82.

Bryant, (Jacob)—grounds of his opinion that Philo Judæus derived his knowledge from Christian sources, i. 215—his striking observations on the *Mystical Sacrifice of the Phenicians*, i. 291, 296.

Buchanan, (Dr. Claudius)—his *Memoir on the expediency of an Ecclesiastical Establishment for British India*, a work deserving most serious attention, i. 84, 87—it presents a melancholy view of the neglect of religion in India by the British, i. 86—exhibits a pleasing picture of the Church of *Malabar*, i. 87—represents that church as possessing the purity of the Protestant profession of Christianity transmitted to it from the apostolic age, *ibid.*

C

Celsus—bears testimony to the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, ii. 210, 213.

Chubb, exhibits curious specimens of deistical arguments against Christianity, i. 99, 104.

Cloppenburg's judicious remarks on the distinction between the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, ii. 8.

Condillac (Abbé de)—his attempt to explain the natural rise and growth of language, i. 416, 418—followed by *Dr. Adam Smith*, and *Mr. Dugald Stewart*, i. 418—his theory untenable, i. 418, 419.

Corruption of human nature, i. 11, 12, 118, 120—fully examined by *Leland*, i. 118—eloquently described by *Mr. Wilberforce*, i. 118, 120—also, by *Mrs. Hannah More*, i. 120—denied in a certain sense, by the *Wesleian Methodists*, as well as by the followers of *Priestley*, i. 121, 122, 127, 128.

Crellius—his criticism on *Isaiah*, liii. and particularly on the phrase *bearing sins*, fully examined, 313, 358.

Cumberland, (Bishop)—opposes the idea of the *Phœnician* sacrifice being derived from the intended sacrifice of *Isaac*, i. 298, the particular impressions under which this writer engaged in the *Review of Sanchoniatho's History* disqualified him for the due discharge of the task, i. 299.

D

Deist, rejects totally the idea of a *Mediator*, i. 3—his objections apply equally to *Natural* as to *Revealed Religion*, i. 3, 10—not a true philosopher, i. 3, 4—cannot prove from reason the sufficiency of repentance, i. 4, 7—well answered by *Balguy*, i. 71, 73—refuted by experience, showing the necessity of a revelation on this head, 5, 8, 53, 99—his objections against a *Mediator* bear with equal force against *repentance* and *prayer*, i. 8.—The error in all such reasonings, i. 9, 10, 104, 106.

Dodson, (Mr.)—his criticisms on *Isaiah* liii. and his endeavours to do away the force of the expression *bearing sins*, carefully examined, i. 306, 358—commended, yet partial in his translation and commentary, i. 307, 308—refers in proof of the justness of his criticisms to writers who have given no proof, i. 318, 319, 334, 342.

E

Erasmus, not always to be relied upon in his Greek criticisms, ii. 349, 350.

Evanson, (Mr.) charges the Evangelists with gross contradictions, i. 133—retains only the Gospel of St. Luke, and but a part of that, i. 133.

F

Fellowes, (Mr.) attacks most unwarrantably the doctrines and articles of the established church, ii. 110, 112—observations upon his writings, *ibid*.

Female writers of modern times, who have contributed by their publications to the advancement of virtue and religion, ii. 152.

G

Geddes, (Dr.)—Specimen of his respect for the writings, and of his qualifications as a translator, of the old testament, i. 370, 381. ii. 185, 186—instance of his grotesque rendering of certain words, i. 239, 240—his absurd view of the sacrifices of the Hebrews as borrowed from the Egyptians, i. 375, 381—opposed and answered by Dr. Priestley, i. 381, 383—his strange distinction between those whom he calls the *vulgar Papists*, and the *vulgar Protestants*, ii. 34, 35.

Grotius—his erroneous translation of Hebr. i. 2. i. 56, 57—charged with Socinianism, 56, 57—his extravagant application of the famous prophecy of Isaiah liii. Jeremiah, i. 312—his strange notion concerning the nature of Abel's sacrifice, examined and confuted, ii. 1, 5—his excellent remarks on the relation subsisting between the Mosaic and the Christian sacrifices, ii. 40, 42—his annotations on the Epistles, not published till after his death, ii. 361—unfoundedly claimed by the modern Socinians, as supporting their opinions, ii. 251.

H

Heath, (Mr.)—The objections urged by him and others, against the antiquity of the book of Job, fully examined, ii. 452, 459.

Heidegger's interpretation of the passage in Gen. i. 23, 24, as a grant of animal food to Adam, shown to be erroneous, i. 400, 402.

Herder's Essay to explain the *natural* acquisition of language, admitted to be the best in support of that notion, and yet radically defective, i. 421.

Hume, (David)—a short view of his character, and of his inveterate and impotent hostility against Revelation, ii. 82, 106—a dangerous guide in *history* as well as in *philosophy*,

ii. 98—106—his calumnies against Luther fully exposed, ii. 101, 104.

I

Ignatius (Saint)—affords strong testimony to the *authenticity* of the *first two chapters of St. Matthew*, ii. 214, 215, 216, 218, 228, 229—nature of his allusions to scripture, and of his writings generally, ii. 228—231.

Indian records—falsely asserted to be prior to the *Mosaic writings*, ii. 63, 72—dishonest attempt in the London Editors of the *Asiatic Researches* to advance their extravagant claims to antiquity, ii. 64.

J

Jehovah, untruly pronounced to have been expressed uniformly, by *Κυριος* in the Septuagint, and never by *Θεος*, ii. 396, 397.

Jews—their notions concerning the state of the dead, unfolded in the explication of their terms *SHEOL* and *REPHAIM*, i. 491, 495—their extraordinary admission of a compact with the FATHER binding the Son to a vicarious suffering for the sins of men, ii. 135, 136.

Job—the reality of the history, and the date and author of the book, carefully considered, i. 439, 525—Various opinions on these heads, and their principal supporters, i. 439, 440, 443, 445, 455, 456, 471, 472—the book an inspired work, i. 468, 469—erroneous objections to the antiquity of the book of Job, by Bishop Stock, and their confutation, i. 470, 521—the history of Job, handed down among the Arabians, i. 521, 523.

Josephus—his testimony, as far as it goes, favourable to the notion of the *propitiatory* virtue of sacrifice, in opposition to the assertion made by Dr. Priestley upon that subject, i. 212, 213—employs expressions which clearly mark the use of the word *ἱλαστήριον* among the Jews in a strict *propitiatory* sense, i. 169.

Justin Martyr—quotes from *Ezra* an extraordinary passage relating to the PASSOVER, i. 233, 234—affords ample testimony to the *authenticity* of the *first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel*, ii. 213, 216, 218, 224.

K

Kennicot, prefers Coverdale's to our present version of the Bible, i. 326—his criticisms on Hebr. xi. 4. not admissible, ii. 9, 17—mistakes the nature of the *Mincha*, ii. 11, 15.

Keschila—the true meaning of this word considered, i. 449, 451.

L

Language—its origin from divine institution, i. 405, 408—of the New Testament peculiar, i. 179, 180—opinions of *Capellus*, *Ernesti*, *Michaelis*, *Middleton*, *Warburton*, *Leland* and *Campbell*, upon this subject, *ibid.*—*figurative* distinguished from *analogical*, i. 192, 193.

Leland, (Dr.) Thomas, of Trinity College, Dublin, has best refuted the objections against the inspiration of the writers of the N. T. derived from their unclassical style, i. 179—an account of his writings, i. 179, 182.

Lincoln, (Bishop of)—on Philip. ii. 5, 6—deserves particularly to be consulted, i. 53—his judicious reflections on the endeavours of the Christian after perfection, i. 125—his excellent observations on subscription to the *Articles of the Church*, ii. 125, 128.

Luther—the calumnies circulated against him by Hume, exposed and refuted, ii. 101, 105.

M

Maimonides—his notion of the origin of sacrifice, i. 200—his opinion of the book of Job, followed by Le Clerc and Michaelis, i. 441—the origin of his celebrated work, the *Moreh Nevochim*, ii. 56—followed by *Spencer* and *Warburton*, ii. 55, 56.

Matthew, (St.) reconciled with Isaiah, i. 313, 331—arguments relating to the authenticity of the first two chapters of his gospel, ii. 197, 205, 210, 211.

Mede—his opinion that sacrifices were essentially *federal feasts*, i. 390, 391—shown to be ill founded, i. 391, 392—his excellent observation on those passages of Scripture which seem to depreciate sacrifices, i. 436.

Michaelis—his exposition of the word *ἱερατεῖον*, i. 169—his opinion of the Apostolical antiquity of the *old Syriac* version of the N. T. i. 178, 179—his objections against the reality of the history of Job examined, i. 441, 445—his arguments in support of the antiquity of the book, i. 456, 458.

Monboddo, (Lord)—his strange theory of the origin of language, i. 415.

More, (Mrs. Hannah,)—a distinguished and powerful advocate of virtue and religion, ii. 152—quoted on the subject of human corruption, i. 523. ii. 1—her just and beautiful observations on *Hume's History*, ii. 100, 106.

Morgan—his absurd idea of the origin of Sacrifice, i. 35, 372, 373—of some use, i. 373.

N

Nares, (Rev. E.)—his *Bampton Lecture* a valuable work, ii. 69, 70—his *Remarks on the Unitarian Version of the New Testament* referred to, i. 364, 365. ii. 188, 209, and in many other places—the cause of Christianity much indebted to him, i. 365, 366. ii. 69.

O

Outram—his work *De Sacrificiis* deserves to be particularly consulted on the Sacrificial doctrine of the Rabbis, i. 199, 272, 279.

P

Parr, (Dr.)—unguardedly commends *Mr. Fellowes's* writings, ii. 131, 134—his eloquent eulogium on Dr. Priestley, ii. 164—his defence of Dr. Thomas Leland, i. 182, 183.

Passover—an accurate discussion of the meaning of the original word, i. 235, 244—shewn to be a sacrifice, i. 226, 235—extraordinary passage relating to it in *Justin Martyr*, i. 233, 234.

Percival, (Dr.)—a distinguished writer, ii. 362—his excellent remarks on *Providence* and *Prayer*, ii. 155, 156—valuable observations on the *Origin of Evil*, the *Evidence of Christianity*, and the *Clerical character and conduct*, ii. 155, 156—*Memoir of his Life and Character* by his son Dr. Edward Percival, ii. 156.

Philo Judæus—not accurately versed in Jewish customs, i. 214, 219, 229—holds a number of doctrines, and particularly those of a *Mediator* and *propitiation*, that closely resemble the Christian doctrines, i. 214, 219—supposed by Bryant to have derived his knowledge from the first Christians, i. 214—this notion opposed by Allix, i. 215.

Popish writers support the notion of the *human invention* of sacrifice, and why, i. 375—those of the present day not entitled to serious consideration, ii. 30, 35.

Porteus (Bishop)—his *Sermons on the Christian doctrine of Redemption*, excellent, i. 99.

Pre-existence—Texts supporting, i. 54, 55—Arguments against, by Grotius, i. 55—by modern Socinians in general, i. 57, 65—by Mr. Lindsey, i. 58—by Mr. Tyrwhitt, i. 59—by Mr. Wakefield, i. 61, 62, 64—by Socinus, i. 63—defended against the above objectors, i. 53, 65.

Price, (Dr.)—his strange opinion concerning *Universals*, ii. 8, 9—offers some excellent observations on the compatibility of the efficacy of prayer with the divine immutability, i. 104, 105—also on the efficacy of *intercession* with the Deity, i. 108, 111—remarks likewise on the beneficial influence of intercessory prayer on the mind of him who offers it, i. 111, 112—to be lamented that such a man should in some points have departed so far from Scripture truth, i. 112.

Priestley, (Dr.)—his irreverent language concerning the sacred writers, i. 66, 67, 132, 134, 197, 312—pronounces it indispensable to his scheme to overturn the received doctrine of Atonement, 69, 71—his boldness of assertion respecting historical facts, i. 92—his historical incompetency fully established, i. 74, 99—his incompetency as a reporter of the Rabbinical opinions and writings, i. 197, 212—his gross misstatement of their writings, and of those of Philo and Josephus, i. 197, 221—his extraordinary power of modifying and applying the testimonies of ancient writers, i. 200, 221—seems as little conversant with classical as with historical writers, i. 221, 222—considers the death of Christ in the same light with that of any other good man, i. 116—misrepresents the arguments in support of the doctrine of atonement, i. 130, 134—charges the sacred writers as ignorant and blundering, i. 132, 134—boasts of having no fixed creed, i. 135—instances of his mode of evading the force of scripture authority, i. 149, 150, 170, 188, 189—directly misstates the book of Job, i. 162, 163—his unjustifiable inaccuracy in Scripture criticism shewn in his remarks on two important passages, Isaiah liii. 10. and 2 Cor. v. 21. i. 171, 184—his strange explanation of the words *for* and *instead*, i. 188, 189—confesses that he *forces* the language of scripture, i. 194, 195—contradicts himself, i. 196, 197—his rejection of the attribute of *Justice* for the purpose of proving the sufficiency of repentance without any other consideration, i. 163, 164—his principles go to exclude all punishment whatever, i. 163—denies that the Passover was a *sacrifice*, i. 226, 227—convicted by the direct words of scripture, and all his arguments on this head shewn to be plainly contradictory to truth, *ibid.*—Passover on the contrary proved to be a sacrifice, i. 227, 231—his endeavours to prove that the *Levitical* atonement contained no idea of *propitiation*, but merely implied ceremonial purification, i. 247—seems not to have attended to the original word כפר, signifying atonement, i. 247, 249—fallacy of his argument, i. 247, 250—confuted, i. 250, 252—his assertion that no trace of the doctrine of atonement is to be found in either New or Old Testament, shewn to be totally unfounded, i. 358, 360—his assertion that no trace of the *principle* of atonement is to be found in scripture, refuted, i. 361,

362—his assertion that the doctrine of atonement sinks our ideas of the divine mercy, refuted, i. 369, 371—maintains in opposition to Geddes, that the Mosaic sacrifices were not borrowed from the Heathens, but had a divine origin, i. 381, 383—in this he contradicts himself, i. 384, 385—his theory of *sacrifice*, i. 385—his reason for denying, in opposition to accumulated facts, that the notion of expiatory sacrifice had ever obtained amongst the heathens, i. 427—his private character and talents, ii. 163, 165—his public conduct censurable, ii. 165, 166—does not fairly follow up his own principles, ii. 170—restrained by early habits, ii. 171—his religious opinions less exceptionable as he advanced in life, ii. 8—his uncharitable animadversions on the established clergy, ii. 173—affirms that Unitarians never become Deists, ii. 175—is directly contradicted by fact, 175—gives such an account of the nature of Academies of the Unitarian description, as proves the progress to infidelity to be almost unavoidable, ii. 169, 170—his theory of Early Opinions entirely overturned by *Mr. Wilson's Illustration*, &c. ii. 261.

Q

Quarterly Review—an excellent article contained therein on the subject of the *Missions to India*, i. 88—its just observations on the nature of *Socinianism*, ii. 172.

R

Rabbis—full account of their opinions on the subject of the *sacrificial Atonement*, proving that they considered sacrifices not only as generally *expiatory*, but as strictly *vicarious*, i. 197, 211—the notion entertained by some of them of the human origin of sacrifice accounted for, i. 208.

Rational Christian—his philosophic lights, ii. 149—see *Unitarians*.

Rational Dissenters—Unitarians so distinguish themselves from the other classes of non-conformists, i. 113, ii. 183—see *Unitarian*.

Redemption—doctrine of, naturally to be rejected by unassisted reason, i. 1, 2—principle of, combated by Socinians with peculiar vehemence, i. 69, 70—in the highest degree necessary to defend it, i. 3, 69—Arguments relating to it misrepresented by Dr. Priestley, i. 18, 19, 130, 131, 134—misrepresented by H. Taylor and others, i. 143, 145, 148—scheme of, held by the Unitarians, i. 10, 11—held by B. Mordecai, i. 16, 17—held by Dr. J. Taylor, of Norwich, i. 138, 142—the doctrine objected to as implying divine implacability, i. 17—objection answered, i. 17, 19—objected to, for want of *connexion* between the means

and the end, i. 19, 20—objection answered, *ibid.* i. 152, 153—objected to on the ground of the scripture phrase of *our being reconciled to God*, i. 20—objection answered, i. 21, 22, 155, 158—objected to on the ground of the divine benevolence, and of the stress laid on this attribute every where, through scripture, i. 23, 163—objection answered, i. 22, 23, 158, 164—nature of the Redemption fully opened up by Isaiah, i. 311, 352—advantageous effects of the scheme of Redemption upon the mind, i. 32—the full comprehension of the principle on which it is founded, impeded by the same difficulty which attaches to other parts of human knowledge, i. 155—see *Atonement*.

Richie, (Dr.)—refutes Dr. Sykes's theory of *sacrifice*, in his *Criticism on modern notions of sacrifice*, i. 389—furnishes an excellent refutation of Dr. J. Taylor's scheme of *Atonement*, i. 142—particularly recommended on the subject of the *origin* of sacrifices, ii. 35.

S

Sacrifice—human, general throughout the ancient world, i. 74, 99—deemed strictly *vicarious* by the Heathens, i. 221, 222—Heathen sacrifice a corruption of the rite divinely instituted, i. 288, 290—a striking instance of this in the *Mystical sacrifice of the Phenicians*, i. 290, 297—contended that the death of Christ was not a *propitiatory sacrifice*, i. 23—answered, i. 23, 27, 169—objected that under the *Law* there was no propitiatory sacrifice whatever, i. 24, 27, 195, 197—objection answered, i. 27, 28, 169, 287—the sacrifice of Christ though spoken of in language *seemingly figurative*, intended as a *real* and *efficacious* sacrifice, i. 192, 194—inconsistency of those who hold the death of Christ to have been but figuratively called a sacrifice, i. 28, 29, 367, 368---that the only true and real sacrifice, the sacrifices of the *Law* being all but figurative of *it*, i. 37, 38—Passover proved to be a sacrifice, and the nature and meaning of this sacrifice explained, i. 226, 227—sense in which the notion of *vicarious* is to be applied to sacrifices in general, i. 28, 268, 270—vicarious *import* of the sacrifices of the *Law*, expressed by the ceremony of the *imposition of hands*, i. 279, 280—more strongly marked by the ceremony of the *Scape Goat*, i. 281, 282—*Sacrifice for Sin* defined, i. 30—means of *reconciliation* by Sacrifice explained, i. 30—not inconsistent with the divine dignity and attributes, i. 30, 31—Sacrifice of Christ differs from all other sacrifices in one important particular, i. 31—nature of Christ's sacrifice usually examined in an erroneous method, i. 34—Supporters of the *human invention* of sacrifice, i. 342, 343—theories of it—by Spencer, i. 35, 383—by the Author of *Scripture ac-*

count of Sacrifices, i. 384—by Dr. Priestley, i. 385—by B. Mordecai, i. 386—by Sykes, i. 35, 387—by Warburton, i. 35, 392—General heads of Argument against all the theories of human invention of Sacrifices, i. 35—only true mode of discovering the origin and nature of the Rite, i. 36---the rite *unnatural* in the view of unassisted reason, i. 423, 424---an argument hence in favour of *divine institution*, i. 427---the rite *universally* practised, an argument in favour of *divine institution*, i. 424, 427---brief view of the Christian sacrifice, i. 36, 37---*Objections* against the origin of sacrifice examined, i. 428, 436---*Divine origin* inferred from Abel's and the early Patriarchal sacrifices, i. 38, 39, 436, 439---the sacrifice of Abel an *animal* sacrifice, ii. 1, 5---Divine origin and true design of sacrifice inferred from the sacrifice of Abel, i. 39, 46---sacrifice of Abel, why accepted, whilst that of Cain was rejected, i. 39, 44. ii. 5, 15---rite instituted at the fall, i. 40, 41. ii. 21, 24---the animal sacrifice peculiarly significant, i. 41, 42---sacrifices before the Law, *animal* and *piacular*, i. 43, 45, 289, 290. ii. 37, 40---true import of the early animal sacrifices before and under the law, i. 289, 290---history of scripture sacrifice shown to be consistent throughout, i. 46, 48---the sacrifice of those under the law, most particularly typical and illustrative of that of Christ, i. 49, 50. ii. 106, 108---sacrifice of Christ in what sense, and how far, *vica-rious*, i. 50, 51.

Scripture Account of Sacrifices, Author of—his scheme of *Redemption*, i. 154, 155—his singular notion concerning the pollution of the Scape-Goat, &c. i. 207, 208—refuted, i. 265—admits that *bearing Sin*, means bearing its punishment, in the case of one's *own* sin, but not in that of *another's*, i. 117—answered, i. 345, 349—his scheme of the origin and meaning of sacrifice, and the objection to it, i. 385, 386.

Septuagint translation of Isaiah, inferior to that of any other part of the Old Testament, i. 100, 308—the translation of Job also inaccurate, and takes great liberties with the original, i. 478—collation of the various copies of the Septuagint by Dr. Holmes, i. 71, 72.

Sharp, (Granville) has, in his *letter on certain particularities of the Hebrew Syntax*, made some excellent remarks on the *converted future of the Hebrew*, i. 465.

Smith, (Dr. Adam) argues from the natural sentiments of mankind, in behalf of the reasonableness of *intercession* and *atonement*, i. 159, 161—infected by his connexion with David Hume, i. 161, 162. ii. 89, 90—his opinion of the process whereby the use of general signs is acquired, i. 418—this opinion controverted, *ibid.*

Smith, (Elizabeth)—her translation of the book of Job, an extraordinary work, i. 500, 501—extracts from, and observations on, that translation, i. 501, 502, 505—praise of her by Mrs. Hannah More, ii. 152.

Socinians distinguished from *Unitarians*, i. 114, 116—their mode of interpreting scripture described, i. 134, 145, 146—their sophistical reasonings to be most carefully watched, i. 364.

Spencer—his error concerning the nature and origin of sacrifice, i. 374, 375, 385—his wrong interpretation of the *εβελουσηνια* of St. Paul, i. 374, 375---his argument derived from the use of the word *dagal* in Heb. xi. 4. refuted, *ibid*---his work, built upon the *Moreh Nevochim* of *Maimonides*, ii. 55---a dangerous guide in theology, ii. 55, 56---refuted by several writers, ii. 54, 55, 58, 60---his reflections upon revelation, ii. 55, 56.

St. David's, (Bishop of,) has given an excellent account of Unitarian management of Scripture, 232, 233---his *Brief Memorial* deserves serious consideration, ii. 239---his excellent observations on the proofs of Christ's divinity derived from his own declarations, ii. 260, 261---has well exposed the dishonest use of Schleusner's name by the Unitarians, ii. 256, 303---also the dishonest use made by them of the names of Locke and Grotius, ii. 267, 325---also of that of Dr. Clarke, ii. 481---has well exposed several of the Unitarian glosses, ii. 294, 302---has made good observations on Mr. Belsham's argument against the existence of a local heaven, ii. 303---has ably exposed the Unitarian rendering of 1 Cor. xv. 47. ii. 401, 403---has beaten down the attempt lately made to set up Dr. Priestley's arguments against Bishop Horsley, ii. 412.

Stock, (Bishop of Killalla)---objects to the generally received idea of the antiquity of the book of Job, i. 470, 472---his objections shown to be unfounded, i. 472, 479---his translation of Job, a hasty, imperfect and highly objectionable performance, i. 470, 521---indulges too freely in conjectural emendations of the sacred text, i. 519, 521.

Sykes, objects to the doctrine of atonement on the ground of texts stating *man's reconciliation to God*, not that of *God to man*, i. 155—states the texts uncandidly, i. 157—his whole objection answered, i. 21, 23, 155, 158—his erroneous criticism on the phrase, *for us*, i. 189, 191—contradicts himself in his endeavours to prove, that Christ, when compared to the Paschal lamb, was not said to be sacrificed, i. 234, 235—his arguments against the doctrine of atonement on the ground of its implying vicarious substitution, stated and answered, i. 270, 279—his affirmation, that the imposition of hands implied nothing vicarious, considered, i. 279, 284—his denial that the scape-goat was a

Sin-offering, examined, i. 282, 284, 350, 351—refers to a text, as proving decisively that *נָסַח* signifies *removing* or *taking away*, which makes directly against him, i. 342, 343—his theory of *sacrifice*, i. 35, 387—shewn to be erroneous, i. 35, 387, 392, 395, 404—contends for the permission of animal food before the flood, i. 395—this notion refuted, i. 395, 404.

T

Taylor, (Henry)—see *Ben Mordecai*.

Taylor, (Dr. John, of Norwich)—his scheme of atonement, i. 138, 142—sum of his scheme, i. 141—falls in with some of the principles of the Socinian, i. 138, 142, 143—his whole scheme but an artful *accommodation* of scripture phrases, i. 138, 139, 142—his *key* a false one, ii. 142—his works imprudently recommended by Bishops, i. 142—the errors of his scheme fully refuted by the author of the *Scripture account of Sacrifices*, and *Dr. Richie's Criticisms on modern notions of atonement*, i. 142—and well pointed out in the *Christian Observer*, ii. 142—difference between his scheme and that of H. Taylor, i. 142—his familiar illustration of his scheme, i. 152, 153—his unjustifiable mode of investigating the nature of the *Levitical* atonement, i. 245, 246—his endeavour to do away the force of the phrase, *bearing sins*, fully examined, i. 313, 358—his erroneous criticism on the word *נָסַח* and the weakness of his endeavour to shew that it merely signifies *removal*, and not *sustaining the penal consequences* of sin, i. 331, 343—is referred to by Mr. Belsham, but turns out too orthodox for him, and is afterwards relinquished by him, ii. 186, 187.

Texts of Scripture—supporting the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, i. 53, 54—texts proving the plan of atonement to have arisen out of the divine *mercy*, i. 18—texts, wrongly urged by Priestley, Sykes and Taylor, in proof of the sufficiency of obedience per se, i. 148, 149—texts representing man as forgiven *freely*, how to be understood, i. 148, 152—texts representing us as *reconciled to God*, not *God as reconciled to us*, misunderstood by Crellius, Sykes, H. and J. Taylor, and others, i. 21, 22, 154, 157—texts proving the displeasure of God against the sinner, i. 22, 23, 158, 276—texts proving the death of Christ to have been a *propitiatory Sacrifice*, i. 23, 171, 302—texts proving the sacrifice of Christ to resemble the paschal sacrifice, i. 226, 235—texts proving that atonement, in the Old Testament, included the idea of averting the divine displeasure, and obtaining forgiveness, i. 276—two important ones cleared from the erroneous criticisms of Dr. Priestley, i. 171, 185—cele-

brated one in Isaiah liii. particularly examined, and its application by St. Matthew vindicated, i. 302, 352—texts ascribing the *bearing of sins* to Christ's sacrifice, and explaining the manner in which this phrase is used in scripture, i. 302, 358—texts in Isaiah liii. fully explanatory of the doctrine of atonement, i. 302, 312, 350, 353—text in 1 Pet. ii. 24 erroneously referred to Isai. liii. 4. i. 314, 353, 354—texts announcing the principle of atonement, i. 353, 359—texts proving the sacrifices of the *Law* to be typical of that of Christ, i. 37, 38—texts erroneously supposed to support the idea of the human invention of sacrifices, ii. 30, 34—text proving Abel's sacrifice to have had a reference to that of Christ, i. 39—text in Gen. iv. 7. explained, i. 42. ii. 25, 36—texts evincing the peculiar virtue of the animal sacrifice, i. 44, 45—texts referred to by *Justin Martyr* and the *Apostolical Fathers*, ii. 220, 230—texts instanced, in which the Unitarian Version of the N. T. has departed from Primate Newcome without notice, and which bear vitally upon the Unitarian question, ii. 243, 244—these and other texts which are disingenuously treated by the Unitarians, considered, ii. 244, 418.

Tillotson's unjustifiable idea of the origin of the plan of redemption by the sacrifice of Christ, ii. 47, 49—confuted, ii. 49, 54—his mistaken supposition of a *Religion of Nature*, ii. 49, 54—his writings recommended by Locke as supplying a model of *perspicuity*, ii. 47.

Tindal—his absurd objection, i. 36, 37, 372—the use to which it may be applied, i. 373.

Townson, (Dr.) gives a good account of St. Matthew's peculiar mode of citing the prophecies, i. 330.

Trimmer, (Mrs.)—a book falsely published under her name by the Unitarians, in order to introduce their heresy into schools, ii. 484, 485.

U

Unitarians—brief view of their scheme, i. 10, 11—their notion of the sufficiency of the *promulgation* of forgiveness on repentance, erroneous, i. 11, 13—adopt a principle of reasoning, in common with the Deist, i. 10—are equally unassailable, on the ground of scripture, with the Deist, i. 13, 14—their strange explication of texts of scripture, i. 55, 65—and appendix with the postscript ubique—mode of reasoning subversive of every possible interpretation of scripture, i. 66, 67, 134—called by Mr. *Howes*, *Humanists*; and by Mr. *Hobhouse*, *Humanitarians*, i. 113, 114—favourers of Mahometanism, i. 102, 104—pretend to be exclusively worshippers of *one God*, i. 113. ii. 140—their

scheme fully explained by Dr. Priestley, and Mr. Belsham, but most compendiously by the latter, i. 114, 140, 143, 190, 191—their scheme difficult to describe, why, ii. 140, 141—they disclaim the title of *Socinians*, i. 115, 116—go far beyond Socinus, i. 115, 117, ii. 303—explain away the meaning of scripture, i. 14, 16, 66, 68, 132, 136—represent the sacred writers as erroneous and unphilosophical, i. 132, 134—differ little from the Theophilanthrope Deists, i. 134, ii. 157—cannot form any canon of scripture, why, i. 135, 136—have lately published a version of the New Testament; nature of that version, ii. 195, 209—in that version admit the substitutive force of the word *unse*, i. 116—reject *humility*, i. 15, 121—agree with the Stoics in their proud notions of virtue, i. 136, 138—refer to each other boldly for proofs which have not been given, i. 319, 321, 335, 341. ii. 183—said to held a *pure* Christianity, ii. 162—said to be persecuted, *ibid.*—said to be a progressive cause, ii. 167—likely to decrease in number, ii. 167, 168, 172—do not all follow up their principles, ii. 170, 171—in one way *seem* to increase in number, ii. 173—naturally pass to Deism, ii. 168, 176—how contrive to retain the bible, ii. 176—they alone sound critics, and why, ii. 177, 181—disingenuous in their treatment of ancient authorities, ii. 216—avowedly reject the received use of language, ii. 233, 236—deprecate the application of critical learning to scripture, and why, ii. 234, 236—dishonestly desert Primate in their version, ii. 243, 244—make a capricious use of the Greek article to establish their own doctrines, ii. 245, 253—make a dishonest use of Schleusner's authority, ii. 255, 257—have adopted an organization similar to the Wesleyan, ii. 238, 407, 499—their mode of interpreting Scripture, ii. 259, 203—have contrived an expedient whereby they can in terms *appear* to admit those doctrines of Scripture which they reject, ii. 285, 287—make an unguarded confession of their dishonest artifices for this purpose, ii. 285, 287—quote Erasmus, Grotius, Clarke, Griesbach, Cyprian, Hilary, Chrysostom, all unfairly, ii. 308, 314—cite Locke's authority unfairly, ii. 316—employ such criticism as the old Socinians would have been ashamed of, ii. 320—put in an unfounded claim to the support of Locke and Grotius, ii. 325—not very fortunate in their references to the ancient classics, ii. 352—substitute the wilderness for the heaven into which the old Socinians fancied our Lord to have been carried up after his baptism, ii. 375—do not follow Griesbach, though they profess to do so, ii. 376—they libel Marcion, whom they profess to admire, ii. 391, 392—have grossly misrepresented Dr. Clarke, ii. 407, 410—the religion of Unitarians not the religion of truth, ii. 421, 424, 462—the absurdity of their arguments, (especially those of Mr. Belsham,) in opposition to the genuineness of the

first two chapters of Matthew and Luke, fully exposed, ii. 424, 468—the indecency of their manner of treating grave subjects and persons, instanced in Mr. Belsham and Mr. Gilchrist, ii. 431, 433—their blasphemous treatment of subjects the most awful, i. 433, 434—the credulity of illiterate Unitarians sadly abused by their popular writers, especially Mr. Belsham, ii. 461, 462—Unitarians to be distinguished into different classes, ii. 468, 479, 491, 497—their attempt to defend (by the pen of Mr. Belsham) their blunder concerning Herod, King of Judea, exposed, ii. 469, 475—not so ignorant with regard to Ephrem Syrus, of the *sixth* century, as they pretend to be, ii. 478—their studiously dishonest use of a title which they admit does not properly belong to them, ii. 479, 497—their false reports of distinguished individuals, and their fabrications of writings under false names, to gain proselytes, ii. 480, 486—have made no progress in Ireland, and but little in America, ii. 479, 488—the true Priestleyan Unitarians confessed by Mr. Belsham to be few in number, ii. 496, 497—they call upon all Dissenters to unite and overturn the Established Church, ii. 497, 498—have adopted the unnatural plan of sending abroad *missionaries* to teach *unbelief*, ii. 499, 500.

Unitarian Version of the New Testament—of a latitude which embraces opinions subversive of Christian doctrines, ii. 195—insidiously professes to found itself on Archbishop Newcome's translation, ii. 196—effected by means of the usual apparatus of Unitarian exposition, ii. 196, 197—avows the design of clearing away all the leading doctrines of the Gospel, ii. 197—is enabled to take the widest liberties of translation by its systematic rejection of verbal criticism, ii. 197, 234, 236—gets rid of the doctrine of the *Incarnation* by rejecting the opening chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, ii. 197—futile and contradictory grounds on which it attempts to maintain this rejection, ii. 197, 203—quotes Lardner's authority in support of the opposite of that which he maintains, ii. 203, 204—does this from a gross blunder in confounding the *true* and *vulgar* eras of the *nativity*, ii. 204, 205—falls into another blunder concerning the *age* and *character* of *Ephrem Syrus*, ii. 205, 206—gives a most extraordinary and absurd translation of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, ii. 207, 208—gives an equally extraordinary and absurd explanation of St. Stephen's address to Christ, ii. 208, 209—the whole of this *new Version* judiciously examined and exposed by Dr. Nares, i. 365. ii. 209, 233, 234—also by Dr. Laurence and Mr. Rennell, ii. 233—proved to be grossly dishonest in its use of the Archbishop's name, ii. 237, 423—its extraordinary use of the terms *THE Son of God*, and *A Son of God*, ii. 246, 249—its absurd interpretation of Luke, i. 35—fully exposed, ii.

245, 269—its absurd interpretation and exposition of Rom. i. 1, 2—exposed, ii. 262, 267—its unscriptural observations on *the two natures* in Christ opposed to the authorities of Locke and Grotius, ii. 266—its erroneous exposition of John i. 12—exposed, ii. 269, 273—its erroneous exposition of John x. 18 exposed, 274, 278—its erroneous exposition of John iii. 13. exposed, ii. 292, 304—its extraordinary glosses upon John iii. 13, iii. 31, vi. 38, vi. 62, exhibited, ii. 293, 294—its erroneous exposition of Rom. ix. 5. exposed, ii. 304, 325—its disingenuous manner of speaking of the text in 1 Tim. iii. 16. noticed, ii. 306—its erroneous exposition of 2 Cor. viii. 9. exposed, ii. 325, 383—its dishonest quotation of Wakefield, ii. 344, 345—its extraordinary exposition of Heb. xii. 25, 26. exposed, ii. 383, 416—its extraordinary treatment of 1 Cor. x. 9. exposed, ii. 386, 399—its unjustifiable treatment of 1 Cor. xv. 47. exposed, ii. 401, 407, its strange jumble of all that relates to angels, spirits and heaven, and especially in the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 412, 416—a mere travesty of the New Testament, ii. 232, 233—the probable reason for adopting Primate Newcome's Version for its basis in preference to Wakefield's, ii. 406, 407, 411, 419—follows the Primate with servility where Unitarian tenets are not affected, ii. 419, 422—copies even his mistakes in such places faithfully, *ibid.* The reason for selecting the Primate's Version, openly confessed, ii. 422, 423.

Universals—the various opinions concerning their nature, i. 406, 414—Aristotle's views on this subject, just, i. 406, 407—excellent remark upon this subject, by Mr. Dugald Stewart, i. 409, 410.

V

Veysie, (Mr.)—his judicious remarks on the sense in which God is said to forgive men *freely*, i. 152—his just distinction on the subject of figurative allusion, i. 117, 193.

Villers—gives, in his *Essay on the Reformation*, a dismal account of the ignorance of scripture enforced by the Romish Church, ii. 31, 32—contrasts the characters of the Protestant and Romish Churches, ii. 32, 33—convicts Hume of falsehoods in his charges against Luther, ii. 101.

W

Walker, (Mr.)—has given, in his *Letter to Mr. Belsham*, an excellent refutation of his reasoning, ii. 142.

Warburton—his strange position that repentance must necessarily entitle to forgiveness, i. 73. ii. 52—his singular theory on the subject of Natural Religion, ii. 49, 52—his well founded obser-

vations on Wesley, i. 130, 131—his paradoxical position concerning the language of the New Testament, i. 179—this well refuted by Dr. Leland, i. 179, 182—his idea of the *scenical* nature of the intended sacrifice of *Isaac*, i. 299—his theory of *Sacrifice*, i. 35, 392—his objections against the divine institution of sacrifice considered, i. 428, 433—his extravagant notion concerning the book of *Job*, i. 445—his unjustifiable adoption of the opinions of *Spencer* and *Maimonides*, ii. 55, 57—his unmerciful laceration of *Bolingbroke*, ii. 60—characters given of him, ii. 57, 58.

Ward's Errata—a meagre abstract of Gregory Martin's ancient refuted work, ii. 33—its recent re-publication a proof of the low state of scripture criticism in the Romish Church, *ibid*—specimen of its miserable cavils against the Protestant translations of the Bible, ii. 33, 34—answered by Dr. Ryan and Mr. Grier, ii. 34—the danger to which these gentlemen are exposed by their attempts to answer it, *ibid*.

Wardlaw, (Mr.)—his just observations on the Unitarian exposition of Rom. ix. 5, ii. 324—his excellent remarks on the Unitarian notion of a mere man possessing divine power, ii. 301, 302—his just exposure of Mr. Belsham's absurd reasoning, ii. 433, 434.

Watson, (B. of Landaff)—his judicious observation on the position that the doctrine of *Atonement* is inconsistent with the divine attribute of mercy, i. 372—his just expression of indignation against the presumption of opposing a fancied philosophy to Apostolic authority, ii. 193.

Watts, (Dr.)—his memory traduced by the Unitarians—and publications falsely issued by them as his, ii. 481, 486.

Wesley—his followers hold opinions of *perfection*, inconsistent with *Christian humility*, i. 121, 122—speak contemptuously of the Clergy of the Established Church, i. 122---not remarkable for the justness and accuracy of their reasonings, i. 122---their numbers rapidly increasing and the reason why, *ibid*---danger to the establishment from the injudicious countenance given to them by some of its members, i. 123, 124—change of the *Liturgy* and *Articles*, and rejection of the *Catechism*, two of the *Creeeds*, and many of the *Psalms*, by Mr. Wesley, i. 123, 124—the *Articles* rejected by him inconsistent with his favourite doctrine of *perfection*, and the rejection derogatory to the dignity of Christ, i. 124, 127, 128—extravagant dogmas maintained by him and his followers, i. 125—proofs of this in the writings of Mr. Wesley, i. 126, 129—his latitudinarian principles respecting doctrines, i. 128, 129—mischievous consequences to true religion, i. 129.

Wilberforce, (Mr.)—his *Practical View*, a book of high value,

i. 68, 117—defended against Dr. Parr, ii. 133—his eloquent description of the corruption of man's natural state, i. 117, 120—describes Unitarianism as a half way house to Infidelity, ii. 159.

Williams—in his *Free Enquiry*, asserts that there are no *certain* references to the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, *till* the days of *Celsus*, ii. 113—this assertion refuted, ii. 113, 215—his strange assertion concerning the *silence* of the Apostolical fathers on those chapters fully examined and confuted, ii. 216, 231—this writer exhibits a striking specimen of the disingenuousness of Unitarian critics, ii. 216.

INDEX OF TEXTS,

EXPLAINED OR REFERRED TO.

<i>Genesis.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>	<i>Genesis.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 3	ii.	135			27, 28
— 28	i.	422			33, 36
— 29	i.	395, 397			37
		400, 401	— 20	i.	393
		402	vi. 4, 7, 11	i.	471
		422	— 14	i.	241
— 30	i.	395, 400	vii. 2	i.	403, 404
		401, 402			405
ii. 9	i.	422	— 11	i.	484
— 16	i.	422	— 21	i.	397
— 19	i.	406, 422	viii. 20	i.	404 ii.
— 20	i.	414			38
— 22, 23	i.	422	— 21	i.	437
iii. 8	i.	422, 471	ix. 3	i.	395, 400
		504, 506	— 4	i.	399
— 9	i.	422 ii. 23	xiv. 5	i.	492
— 10	i.	422, 506	— 22	i.	454
— 11	i.	422	xv. 2, 7, 8	i.	454
— 12	i.	422, 471	— 9	i.	390, 397
		504	— 10, 18	i.	390
— 14—20	i.	422	— 17	i.	390
— 21	i.	422			438
	ii.	23	xvii. 27	i.	298
— 22	i.	422	xviii. 20	ii.	26
iv. 3	i.	431	— 32	i.	100
	ii.	6	xix. 3	i.	397
		7	xx. 7	i.	108
	ii.	21	— 9	ii.	26
4	i.	375	xxii. 2	i.	295, 296
		438, ii. 1	xxiii. 6	i.	296
	ii.	9	xxiv. 3	i.	454
— 5	i.	375	xxv. 31—34	ii.	1
— 6	ii.	27	xxvi. 24	i.	108
— 7	i.	43 ii.	xviii. 13, 16	i.	454
		5, 25	— 32	i.	108

<i>Genesis.</i>	v.	p.
xxix. 1	i.	335
xxx. 44	ii.	362
xxxii. 9	i.	454
— 20	ii.	14
xxxiii. 19	i.	441, 450
xxxvii. 35	i.	492
xlili. 11, 15	ii.	14
— 33	ii.	1
xliv. 18	i.	483

Exodus.

i. 11	i.	325
iii. 2, 4	i.	377
v. 2	i.	262
vi. 3	i.	377
—	i.	454
— 9	i.	307
x. 17	i.	342
— 25	ii.	38, 39
xii. 5	i.	283
— 8, 21	i.	228
— 11	i.	236, 238
— 12	i.	236
— 13	i.	236, 238
—		241, 242
— 19	i.	103
— 23	i.	236, 238
—		241, 242
— 27	i.	226, 229
—		229, 236
—		238, 243
— 29	i.	495
xv. 25, 26	i.	435
xvi. 8	i.	434
— 13	i.	482
xviii. 11	i.	262
— 12	ii.	38, 39
xx. 7	i.	273
xxi. 2—6	i.	453
— 14	i.	262
xxii. 26	ii.	23
xxiii. 7	i.	310
— 18	i.	227, 228
xxiv. 8	i.	390
— 10	ii.	410

<i>Exodus.</i>	v.	p.
xxviii. 38	i.	332, 334
—		335
xxix. 14	i.	187
—		25, 26
xxx. 9	ii.	14
— 10	ii.	25
— 12, 14, 16	i.	166
xxxii. 21	ii.	26
— 30	i.	252
—		26
— 32	i.	252
xxxiv. 6	i.	333
— 7	i.	333, 337
—		342
— 9	i.	337
— 25	i.	227, 228
— 30	ii.	23

Leviticus.

	v.	p.
i. 3	i.	286
— 4	i.	27, 230
—		285
— 4—9	i.	230
— 5	i.	230
ii. 1	ii.	9, 13, 14
—		16
— 6	ii.	13, 16
ii. 13	i.	390, 391
iii. 2—5	i.	230
iv. 2	i.	258, 263
— 3	i.	275 ii. 25
— 3—12	i.	271
— 6	i.	449
— 13, 14	i.	258
— 13—22	i.	275
— 21	ii.	25, 26
— 23	i.	258
— 24	i.	230 ii. 25
—		26
— 28	i.	258
— 29	ii.	25
v. 2, 3	i.	258
— 4	i.	264, 273
— 8	i.	187
— 9	i.	187 ii. 26

<i>Leviticus.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
— 10	i.	253
— 11	i.	187
— 13, 16	i.	253
— 17	i.	258
— 18	i.	253, 258
vi. 1, 2	i.	264
— 2—7	i.	27
— 3	i.	273
— 7	i.	253
— 18	i.	284
— 23, 26	i.	339
— 25	ii.	25
vii. 2	i.	187
— 8	i.	372
		22
ix. 22	i.	335
— 24	i.	438
x. 17	i.	332, 334
		335, 338
		339
xi. 44—46	i.	398
xiv. 20, 26 } 31, 53 }	i.	252
xvi. 5	i.	282
	ii.	108
— 6	i.	282
— 7, 9	ii.	108
— 10	i.	282
		108
— 11	i.	282
— 15—28	i.	275
— 16—20	i.	249
— 17	ii.	108
xvi. 21	i.	273, 281
		337
— 22	i.	281, 332
		334, 337
— 26	i.	281
xvii. 11	i.	45, 272
		273, 338
xix. 20	i.	27
— 22	i.	253
xx. 19	i.	356
— 23	i.	80
xxii. 21	i.	283

<i>Leviticus.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
xxiv. 14, 15	i.	285
— 16	i.	273
xxvi. 18, 23, 28	i.	305
— 39	i.	260

Numbers.

ix. 5, 6, 7	i.	228
— 13	i.	228, 229
xi. 31	i.	481, 482
— 32	i.	482
— 33	i.	471, 480
		481, 482
— 34	i.	471, 480
		481
— 13—20	i.	108
xiv. 18	i.	333, 337
		342
— 19	i.	333
— 33	i.	344, 345
		347, 355
		356, 357
xv. 22	i.	259
— 24	i.	258
— 24—28	i.	259
— 25, 26, 28	i.	253
— 27	i.	261
— 30	i.	259, 261
		262
— 31	i.	262
xvi. 46, 47, 48	i.	252
xviii. 1	i.	335
— 8	i.	337
— 12	ii.	4
xix. 2	i.	283
xxii. 22	i.	456
xxiv. 2	i.	335
xxv. 11, 13	i.	252
xxxiii. 1	i.	449

Deuteronomy.

i. 42, 43	i.	262
iii. 11	i.	492
vii. 7	i.	307

Deuteronomy. v. p.

ix. 18—19	i. 108
xi. 2	i. 305
xii. 5, 6, 11 14	i. 228
xiv. 3	i. 404
xvi. 2	i. 227, 227
— 4	i. 227, 229
— 5, 6	i. 227, 229
xvii. 12, 13	i. 262
xviii. 10	i. 290
— 22	i. 262
xxi. 8	i. 305
xxii. 18	i. 305
xxiv. 1	i. 366
xxv. 1	i. 309
xxvii. 21	i. 331
— 26	i. 264, 373

Joshua.

ii. 9	i. 286
xxiv. 32	i. 449

Judges.

vi. 6	ii. 352
— 18	ii. 47
— 21	i. 473
xiv. 15	ii. 352
xv. 4	ii. 18

1 Samuel.

ii. 7	ii. 358
— 17	ii. 13
xv. 22	i. 434
xxiii. 26	i. 237
xxix. 4	i. 156

2 Samuel.

i. 16	i. 286
xviii. 33	i. 191
xix. 22	i. 456
xxiv. 16	i. 472, 510

1 Kings. v. p.

v. 4	i. 456
viii. 29	i. 228
— 32	i. 310
x. 25	ii. 14
xi. 14, 23, 25	i. 456
xii. 11, 14	i. 307
xviii. 29, 35	ii. 113
— 38	i. 438
xii. 19—23	i. 443

2 Kings.

iii. 20	ii. 13
vi. 9	i. 345
xii. 16	ii. 25
xxiv. 12	i. 472
xxv. 27	i. 472

1 Chronicles.

xxi. 15	i. 472, 510
— 26	i. 438

2 Chronicles.

ii. 2, 12	i. 320
vi. 23	i. 310
vii. 1	i. 438
— 16	i. 228
viii. 1	ii. 5
xi. 24	ii. 14
x. 11, 14	i. 307
xxix. 23	i. 283
xxx. 15, 16	i. 228, 230
xxxii. 23	ii. 14
xxxiv. 13	i. 320
xxxv. 5, 6, 10	i. 227
— 11	i. 227, 228

Ezra.

ix. 4, 5	ii. 13
----------	--------

Nehemiah.

iv. 45	i. 248
--------	--------

<i>Esther.</i>	v.	p.
vii. 8	ii.	483
viii. 1, 7	ii.	483
ix. 25	i.	286

<i>Job.</i>	v.	p.
i. 4	i.	162
i. 5	i.	44, 390
	ii.	38
ii. 9	i.	478
iii. 19	i.	453
v. 6	i.	459
vii. 9	i.	487
viii. 10	i.	459
x. 11	ii.	23
— 16	i.	506
xi. 8	i.	487
xii. 12	i.	444
— 17	i.	472
xiv. 13	i.	487
xv. 10	i.	444
— 30	i.	456
xvi. 2	i.	317
— 6	i.	317
xvii. 13, 16	i.	487
— 23	i.	494
xviii. 13	ii.	2
xix. 4	i.	478
— 20, 26	ii.	23
— 23—29	i.	469
xx. 9	ii.	487
— 20	i.	472, 479
— 22	i.	469
xxi. 13	i.	487
xxiv. 19	i.	487
xxvi. 5	i.	472, 484
		492, 489
xxviii. 8	i.	506, 507
xxix. 8	i.	444
xxx. 1	i.	444
— 29	i.	507
xxxi. 28	i.	458
— 33	i.	478, 504
— 34	i.	506
xxxii. 6	i.	444
xxxiii. 19	i.	317

<i>Job.</i>	v.	p.
xxxiii. 23	i.	472, 478
xxxiv. 17—19	i.	501
— 17—20	i.	500
— 18	i.	502
— 19	i.	502
— 20	i.	472, 492
		502
— 20—28	i.	501
— 23, 24	i.	502
— 26	i.	489
— 37	i.	490
xxxvi. 8—12	i.	472
— 18	i.	490
— 28	i.	478
xxxvii. 13	i.	32
xxxviii. 1	i.	468
xxxix. 34	i.	478
xl. 1—14	i.	520
xli. 6, 7	i.	520
— 14	i.	453
xlii. 5	i.	468
— 7, 8	i.	23, 162
	ii.	38
— 10	i.	108
— 11	i.	450, 519
— 12	i.	519

<i>Psalms.</i>	v.	p.
vi. 1	i.	305
vii. 16	i.	286
xiv. 13	i.	317
xvi. 10	i.	492
xx. 3	i.	438
xxv. 7	i.	261
xxx. 4	i.	492
— 7	i.	325
xxxii. 1	i.	248
— 6	i.	337
— 10	i.	317
xxxiii. 3	ii.	29
xxxiv. 10	ii.	352
xxxviii. 1	i.	305
— 17	i.	317
xxxix. 11	i.	305
xl. 6	i.	433

<i>Psalms.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
xl. 7	i.	187
xlix. 16	ii.	362
l. 5, 16	i.	390
— 8, 9, 13	i.	433
li. 16	i.	433
lxix. 29	i.	317
lxxi. 13	i.	456
lxxii. 10	ii.	14
lxxix. 8	ii.	352
lxxx. 16	ii.	4
lxxxii. 3	i.	378
lxxxv. 2	i.	248
lxxxvi. 15	i.	333
lxxxviii. 30	i.	481
lxxxix. 50	i.	310
xc. 13	i.	506
xciv. 17	i.	492
cii. 3	i.	322
civ. 4	i.	378
cv. 40	i.	482
cix. 20, 29	i.	456
cxviii. 18	i.	305
cxlvii. 14	ii.	4

Proverbs.

iii. 11	i.	305
ix. 18	i.	493
xiii. 7	ii.	354
— 24	i.	305
xv. 8	i.	433
xvii. 15	i.	310
xix. 18	i.	305
xx. 4	i.	307
xxi. 17	ii.	5
— 16	ii.	5
	i.	493
xxii. 15	i.	305
xxiii. 4	ii.	362
— 21	ii.	352
xxvi. 13	i.	506
xxvii. 20	i.	494
xxviii. 22	ii.	362
xxx. 16	i.	494
— 29	ii.	29

<i>Ecclesiastes.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 18	i.	317
ii. 18	i.	317

Isaiah.

i. 11, 12	i.	433
ii. 9	i.	505
v. 14	i.	487, 494
— 23	i.	310
vii. 14	i.	359
ix. 6	i.	57
x. 27	i.	320
xiv. 6	i.	486, 487
		489
— 11, 15	i.	487
xxiii. 16	ii.	29
xxvi. 14	i.	492
— 16	i.	305
xxviii. 4	ii.	2
— 7	i.	260
— 15, 18	i.	487
xxxi. 5	i.	238, 240
		242, 343
xxxiii. 24	i.	331
xxxv. 5	i.	328
xxxviii. 10, 18	i.	487
xl. 2	i.	345
xlvi. 4	i.	319, 321
xliv. 23	i.	455
l. 8	i.	310
li. 6	i.	486
liii. 3	i.	318
— 4	i.	276, 303
— 4	i.	304, 313
		334
		352, 354
		357
— 5	i.	303, 304
		308
— 5—8	i.	169
— 9—10	i.	303
— 6	i.	302, 305
		347
— 7	i.	165
		306
	ii.	128

<i>Isaiah.</i>	v.	p.
liii. 8	i.	307
— 10	i.	24, 171 175 184, 187 303, 308
— 11	i.	304, 309 310 315, 319 331, 343 344, 354 357
— 12	i.	302, 304 311, 315 331, 344 357
lvii. 9	i.	487
lx. 16	i.	488, 455
lxv. 14	i.	317
lxvi. 3	i.	433

<i>Jeremiah.</i>	v.	p.
ii. 19, 30	i.	305
v. 3	i.	305
— 27	ii.	362
vii. 22	i.	433, 435
— 23	i.	435
x. 24	i.	305
xxiii. 6	ii.	395
xxiv. 2	ii.	2
xxx. 11, 14	i.	305
— 15	i.	317
xxxi. 18	i.	305
— 29	i.	345
— 30	i.	345
xlvi. 28	i.	305
li. 6	i.	345
— 9	i.	335

<i>Lamentations.</i>	v.	p.
iv. 21	i.	447
v. 7	i.	310, 319 344 346, 355

<i>Ezekiel.</i>	v.	p.
i. 19, 20, 21	i.	355

<i>Ezekiel.</i>	v.	p.
i. 26	ii.	256
iii. 14	i.	335
iv. 4, 5	i.	332
v. 15	i.	305
x. 26	i.	335
xiv. 14	i.	468
xxviii. 2	i.	345, 346 347
— 13	i.	347
— 19, 20	i.	344 347, 355
— 19, 23	i.	273
xx. 15, 23	i.	335
xxiii. 48	i.	305
xxxii. 30	i.	280
xxxiii. 32	ii.	29
xliv. 29	i.	167
xlvi. 23	ii.	25

<i>Daniel.</i>	v.	p.
ii. 35	i.	335
iii. 33	ii.	271
iv. 31	ii.	271
vii. 13, 14	ii.	256
xii. 3	i.	311

<i>Hosea.</i>	v.	p.
iv. 8	i.	187
— 15	ii.	25
v. 14	i.	261
vi. 6	i.	507
vii. 12	i.	434
x. 13	i.	305
xii. 8	i.	345
xiii. 7	ii.	362
	i.	507

<i>Joel.</i>	v.	p.
ii. 13	i.	434

<i>Amos.</i>	v.	p.
v. 21, 22	i.	433

<i>Micah.</i>	v.	p.
v. 2	ii.	223, 224

<i>Nahum.</i>	<i>v. p.</i>	<i>Matthew.</i>	<i>v. p.</i>
iii. 11	i. 307	ii. 2, 11, } 12, 6, } 18 }	ii. 222, 224
<i>Habakkuk.</i>		iii. 6	ii. 466
ii. 5	i. 494	— 15	ii. 228
<i>Zechariah.</i>		iv. 36	ii. 248
ii. 13	i. 443	v. 3, 7, 10 } 44 }	ii. 229
iii. 1	i. 443	— 23	i. 21
v. 7	i. 335	— 24	i. 22, 156 157
xi. 5	ii. 362	— 28	ii. 227
xii. 3	i. 325	— 42	ii. 226, 227
xiv. 19	i. 345	vi. 12—15	ii. 229
<i>Malachi.</i>		— 25	ii. 16
i. 13	ii. 13	vii. 1, 2	ii. 226, 229
— 14	i. 283	— 3	ii. 274
	ii. 47	— 12	ii. 226
ii. 7	ii. 33	— 29	ii. 271
iii. 1	ii. 33	viii. 17	i. 312 316, 222 330, 352
<i>Tobit.</i>		— 22	ii. 301
iv. 21	ii. 352	ix. 2	i. 329, 330 331
<i>Judith.</i>		ix. 13	ii. 226
v. 19, 20	i. 261	— 42	ii. 226
xv. 7	ii. 362	x. 15	ii. 249
<i>Wisdom.</i>		— 16	ii. 228
iii. 5	i. 305	— 32, 33	ii. 227
<i>Ecclesiasticus.</i>		xi. 4	i. 329
ix. 17	ii. 362	— 10	ii. 33
xvii. 5	i. 422	— 22, 24	ii. 249
<i>1 Maccabees.</i>		xii. 33	ii. 228
xiii. 39	i. 260	— 36	ii. 249
<i>Matthew.</i>		— 41	ii. 16
i. 16	ii. 440	xiii. 5—7, 20 } — 22, 31, } 32 }	ii. 227
— 17	ii. 440	— 15	i. 330
— 19	i. 366	xiv. 33	ii. 248
— 21	i. 359	— 19	ii. 274
	ii. 220	xv. 9	i. 374
— 23	ii. 215, 220	xvi. 24	ii. 226
		xviii. 3, 4	ii. 227

<i>Matthew.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
— 6	ii.	226
— 19, 20	ii.	228
— 35	i.	265
xix. 12	ii.	228
— 23, 24		227
— 29	ii.	274
xx. 12	i.	323
— 16	ii.	226
— 28	i.	169, 182 272, 353 359
xxii. 43, 44	ii.	226
xxiii. 6	ii.	227
xxiv. 22	ii.	226
xxv. 5, 6, 10	ii.	226
xxvi. 24	ii.	226
— 26	i.	234, 272
— 28	i.	46, 169 354, 359
— 31		226
— 41		229
xxvii. 53	ii.	334
— 65	ii.	259
— 54	ii.	248
xxviii. 13	ii.	227

<i>Luke.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 5	ii.	470
— 30—35	ii.	389
— 31	ii.	220, 221
— 32	ii.	253
— 35	ii.	243, 257 264
— 53	ii.	354
— 77	i.	261
ii. 23	ii.	258
iii. 1, 2, 3	ii.	470
— 23	ii.	200
— 24	ii.	440
iv. 3	ii.	248
vi. 30	ii.	226
— 36, 37, 38	ii.	227
vii. 14	i.	324
— 27	ii.	33
xii. 5	ii.	270
xiii. 24, 25	ii.	227
xiv. 27	i.	324 ii. 228
xvi. 18	ii.	227
xvii. 2	ii.	227
xviii. 12	ii.	8
xxii. 70	ii.	245

<i>Mark.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 4	ii.	470
— 22	ii.	271
ii. 8	ii.	404
— 9	ii.	349
iv. 12	i.	331
v. 26	i.	321
— 41	ii.	278
vii. 7	ii.	436
ix. 49	i.	390
— 50	ii.	227
x. 45	i.	169
— 46	i.	272
xii. 26	i.	379
xiv. 13	i.	324
— 22	i.	229
— 64	ii.	260

<i>John.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 1	ii.	117
— 1—14	i.	62 ii. 117
— 3	ii.	316
— 6	ii.	300
— 10	i.	60
— 12	ii.	243, 271 276
— 13	ii.	243, 292 295, 304 319, 340
— 14	ii.	263
— 15	ii.	341
— 17, 18	ii.	274, 409
— 18	ii.	289, 291 292, 319 340, 341

<i>John.</i>	<i>v. p.</i>	<i>John.</i>	<i>v. p.</i>
— 27	ii. 250, 253 256	xv. 26	ii. 120
— 28, 29	ii. 278	xvi. 7, 8, 13	ii. 120
— 29	i. 24, 164 166, 167 233, 359	— 11	ii. 228
— 31	ii. 293	— 12	i. 324, 326 361
— 50	ii. 245	— 28	i. 55 ii. 228, 297 299
ii. 19	ii. 272, 274 278, 279	xvii. 5	i. 53 ii. 328
iii. 8	ii. 228	xix. 7	ii. 245, 260
— 13, 31	i. 55	— 36	i. 234
— 16	i. 18	xx. 15	i. 324, 326
v. 14	i. 331		
— 30	i. 366	<i>Acts.</i>	
vi. 27	i. 434	i. 7	ii. 271
— 38	i. 55 ii. 294	ii. 24	ii. 229, 272
— 62	i. 55, 67 ii. 294, 300 302	— 32	ii. 278
vii. 24	i. 366	iii. 15	ii. 272
viii. 29	ii. 228	— 17	i. 259
— 56	ii. 408	iv. 12	ii. 221
— 57, 58	i. 62, 65 ii. 324 342, 343	v. 41	ii. 227
ix. 17	ii. 338	vii. 2	ii. 409
— 25	ii. 334, 337	— 15, 16	i. 454
x. 9	ii. 228	— 30, 32	ii. 410
— 18	ii. 272 280	— 56	ii. 209, 257
xi. 44	ii. 278	— 59, 60	ii. 208, 209
— 50	i. 191, 359	viii.	i. 165, 169
xi. 51, 52	i. 359	— 33	i. 169
xii. 6	i. 324, 359	— 35	i. 312
— 41	ii. 407	ix. 20	ii. 264
— 49	ii. 228	x. 38	ii. 397
— 49, 50	ii. 278	— 40	ii. 278
xiii. 3	i. 55 ii. 297, 299	— 41	ii. 335
— 7	ii. 335	— 42	ii. 226
— 12	ii. 273	— 43	ii. 221
— 37	ii. 335	xiii. 22	ii. 227
xiv. 6	ii. 227	— 32, 33	ii. 18
		— 33	ii. 264
		xv. 10	i. 323
		xvii. 31	ii. 272, 278
		xx. 28	ii. 209
		— 35	ii. 227
		xxv. 24	ii. 187
		xxvi. 18	ii. 270

<i>Romans.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 1, 2	ii.	262
— 3	ii.	317
— 4	ii.	245
	ii.	274
— 7	ii.	314
— 29—32	i. 12 13 ii.	227
ii. 5	i.	366
— 20	ii.	227
iii. 24	i.	169
— 25	i.	168, 169 363
— 26	i.	164, 363 366
iv. 3	ii.	226
— 25	i. 169, 353	ii. 109
v. 6	i.	353
— 6, 10	i.	169
— 8	i.	191
— 9	i.	159
— 10	i.	156, 157 159
— 11	i.	24, 185
— 16	i.	261 ii. 226
vi. 4	i.	56 ii. 272 278
viii. 3	i.	184
— 11	ii.	227, 278
— 27	ii.	186
— 32	i.	24, 131
— 33	i.	309
— 34	ii.	185
— 38, 39	ii.	228
ix. 4	ii.	227
— 5	ii.	227, 243 266, 304 308
— 10, 11, 12	ii.	226
— 21,	ii.	270
x. 3	i.	259
— 17	ii.	17
xi. 2	ii.	186
— 15	i.	157, 184

<i>Romans.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
— 29	ii.	227
— 36	ii.	226
xii. 17	ii.	229
xiii. 9, 10	ii.	229
xiv. 1, 3	ii.	227
— 10, 12	ii.	229
xv. 1	i.	324 ii. 227
— 7	ii.	227, 228
— 8	ii.	226

<i>Corinthians.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 5	ii.	362, 363
— 10	ii.	228
— 12	ii.	227
— 18, 19, 20	ii.	228
— 23, 24	i.	1
ii. 11	ii.	413
iii. 16	ii.	226, 227
— 17	ii.	227
— 19	i.	461
iv. 4	ii.	228
— 8	ii.	363
v. 7	i.	169, 226 233, 234
	ii.	228
— 11	ii.	229
vi. 2	ii.	229
— 9, 10	ii.	228, 229
vii. 11	i.	156, 157
	ii.	227
— 15	ii.	227
ix. 4, 5, 6	ii.	272
x. 9	ii.	386
— 24	ii.	227
xi. 20	ii.	226
— 26	i.	46
xii. { 12, 15, }	ii.	227
{ 22, 24, }		
xiii. 4	ii.	227
— 7	i.	320
— 12	ii.	335
xv. 3	i.	169, 353
— 8	ii.	228

1 Corinthians.	v.	p.
— 15	ii.	272
— 20	ii.	227
xv. 45	ii.	404
	ii.	406
— 47	ii.	55 ii.
		392, 393
		402, 404
		405, 406
— 48, 49	ii.	404, 405
xvi. 7	ii.	335

2 Corinthians.		
iii. 18	ii.	227
iv. 14	ii.	229
v. 14, 15	ii.	228
— 17	ii.	226
— 18	i.	157, 188
— 19	i.	157
		185
— 20	i.	156, 157
— 21	i.	169, 171
		179, 235
		284, 187
		353
vi. 7	ii.	229
vii. 10	ii.	227
viii. 5	ii.	227
— 9	ii.	244, 339
		344, 347
		357, 360
		362, 366
— 21	ii.	229
x. 17, 18	ii.	227
xi. 24, 24	ii.	227
— 31	ii.	319
xii. 2, 4,	i.	435
xiii. 4	ii.	109

Galatians.		
i. 1	ii.	228, 229
— 4	i.	191 ii.
		227
iii. 10	i.	264, 273

Galatians.	v.	p.
— 13	i.	353
— 24	i.	48
— 27	ii.	227
iv. 4	ii.	256
— 26	ii.	229
v. 4	ii.	220
— 10	i.	324
vi. 2	i.	324
— 7	ii.	229

Ephesians.		
i. 7	i.	169
— 19, 20	ii.	264
ii. 2	ii.	226
— 5	ii.	337,
— 8, 9	ii.	229
— 16	i.	157
— 22	ii.	228
iii. 9	i.	58, 59 ii.
		188
iv. 3	ii.	228
— 4, 5	ii.	227, 228
— 6	ii.	227
— 18	i.	259
— 20	ii.	229
— 26	ii.	229
— 30, 31		227
v. 2,	i.	24, 37
	ii.	228
— 10	i.	232
— 16, 17	ii.	226
— 25, 29	ii.	228
vi. 13, 14 }	ii.	228
16, 17 }		

Philippians.		
i. 10	ii.	227
— 21	ii.	228
ii. 3	ii.	228
— 5	ii.	227, 228
		314, 326
		329, 360
		366
		367, 380

<i>Philippians.</i>	v. p.	
— 6, 7	i. 53	ii.
	227	
— 8	i. 55	
— 10, 11, 16	ii. 229	
iv. 5	ii. 226	
— 18	ii. 228	

<i>Collossians.</i>		
i. 7	ii. 228	
— 10	ii. 227	
i. 14	i. 169	
— 15, 16	i. 55, 59 ii.	
	188, 409	
— 16	i. 57, 60	
— 17	i. 57, 59	
— 20, 21	i. 157	
— 28	ii. 229	
ii. 13	ii. 337	
— 22, 23	ii. 4	

1. <i>Thessalonians.</i>		
ii. 7	ii. 335	
iv. 16	ii. 278	
— 16, 17	ii. 302	
v. 4, 5, 7, 8	ii. 297	
— 13	ii. 228	
— 17	ii. 228, 229	
— 18, 23	ii. 227	
— 22	ii. 229	

2. <i>Thessalonians.</i>		
i. 5	i. 366	
iii. 15	ii. 229	

1. <i>Timothy.</i>		
i. 13	i. 259	
ii. 1, 12	ii. 229	
— 6	i. 169, 182	
	272, 253	
— 8	ii. 227	
— 16	i. 469	
iii. 13	ii. 227	
— 16	ii. 264, 305	
	394	

1. <i>Timothy.</i>	v. p.	
v. 4	ii. 227	
vi. 4	i. 322	
— 7, 10	ii. 229	

2. <i>Timothy.</i>		
i. 9	ii. 227	
— 10	ii. 226	
— 14	ii. 227	
— 16, 18	ii. 228	
ii. 4	ii. 228	
— 9	i. 320	
— 11, 12	ii. 229	
iv. 8	i. 366	
— 10	ii. 229	
— 18	ii. 228	
— 22	ii. 413	
vi. 9, 18	ii. 363	

<i>Titus.</i>		
ii. 3	ii. 228	
— 13	ii. 314	
— 14	i. 353	
iii. 1	ii. 227	

<i>Philemon.</i>		
— 20	ii. 228	

<i>Hebrews.</i>		
i. 2	i. 55	
	ii. 138	
— 3	i. 55, 169	
	ii. 227	
— 4, 5	ii. 227	
— 7	i. 411, 412	
	227	
— 13	ii. 227	
ii. 6	ii. 257	
— 7, 9	ii. 414, 416	
— 17	i. 169, 171	
iii. 2	ii. 227	
— 5	ii. 226, 227	
iv. 12	ii. 227, 229	
— 13	ii. 229	
vi. 8	ii. 242	
18	722	

<i>Hebrews.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
vii. 4	ii.	419
— 13, 14, 17	i.	224
— 25	ii.	185
— 26	ii.	247
— 27	i.	24
ix. 1	ii.	75
— 7	i.	260, 261
— 9	i.	266, 267
	ii.	75
— 9—14	i.	38
— 12, 13, 14	} ii.	75
22, 23		
24, 26		
ix. 12—28	i.	169
— 14	i.	267
— 22	i.	33, 45
	ii.	42
		75
— 26, 28	i.	187
— 28	i.	187, 358
x. 1	i.	26, 37
		266 ii.
		446
— 10, 14, 18	i.	169
— 12	i.	37
— 25	ii.	226
— 26	i.	158, 262
— 27, 30, 31	i.	158
— 28	ii.	228
— 29	ii.	75, 228
xi. 3	i.	57
— 4	i.	40, 407
		471 ii. 40
		43, 47
		50
— 5, 7, 8	ii.	227
— 13	ii.	51, 52
		53
— 16	ii.	54
— 21	ii.	67
— 31—39	ii.	227
xii. 1, 2, 6,	} ii.	227
9, 10,		
11		
— 12	ii.	362

<i>Hebrews.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
— 17	ii.	228
— 24	i.	43, 45
		232 ii.
		75, 416
— 25, 26	ii.	244, 383
xiii. 9	ii.	228
— 11	i.	185
— 20, 21	i.	52

<i>James.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 5	ii.	227, 228
— 6, 7, 8	ii.	227
ii. 7	ii.	228
— 10	i.	273
— 21, 23	ii.	227
iii. 13	ii.	227
— 15, 17	ii.	228
iv. 2	ii.	228
— 3, 4	ii.	227, 228
— 6	ii.	227
— 7, 12	ii.	243
v. 1, 2, 4	ii.	228
— 11	i.	502
— 15	i.	330

<i>1. Peter.</i>	<i>v.</i>	<i>p.</i>
i. 6, 7	ii.	228
— 8, 13	ii.	229
— 10	ii.	413
— 12	ii.	413
— 14	i.	259
— 17	ii.	226
— 18, 19	i.	19, 166
		169
— 20	i.	18
— 21	ii.	229
ii. 5	ii.	226
— 11, 12,	} ii.	244
17, 22		
— 24	i.	312, 314
		327, 330
		350, 354
		357
	ii.	229
iii. 9, 14	ii.	229

1. <i>Peter.</i>	<i>v. p.</i>
— 15	ii. 228
— 17	i. 320
— 18	i. 353
— 19	ii. 302
iv. 5, 7	ii. 229
— 8	ii. 227
v. 5	ii. 227, 228
	229
— 7	ii. 228

2. <i>Peter.</i>	
i. 3	i. 56
— 21	i. 133
ii. 4, 5, 7, 8	i. 464
— 5, 6, 7, 9	ii. 227
— 9	ii. 249
— 15, 20	ii. 228
iii. 4	ii. 227
— 10	ii. 226

1. <i>John.</i>	
i. 2	ii. 228
ii. 2	i. 24, 168
	169, 186
ii. 7	ii. 229
— 27	ii. 228
iv. 2	ii. 266
— 3	ii. 229
— 6	ii. 228
— 10	i. 19, 24
	168, 169
	186

1. <i>John.</i>	<i>v. p.</i>
— 17	ii. 250
v. 6	ii. 228
— 7	ii. 431

2. <i>John.</i>	
4	ii. 228

3. <i>John.</i>	
2	ii. 228
3, 4	ii. 228

<i>Jude.</i>	
3	ii. 229
9, 14, 15	i. 430
21, 24	ii. 228

<i>Revelations.</i>	
i. 13	ii. 257
iii. 17, 18	ii. 363
iv. 1, 2	i. 442
v. 9	i. 167
— 9—12	i. 169
xiii. 8	i. 19, 41
	169
xiv. 14	ii. 257
xviii. 3, 15, 19	ii. 363
xix. 2	i. 366
xx. 6	ii. 270, 337
xxii. 8	ii. 336
12	ii. 226

The editions of such books as have been quoted by a reference to pages, or other appropriate marks, throughout the preceding work, are here subjoined.

- Abarban. Exord. Comm. in Levit. De Viel. - Lond. 1683
 Acosta. History of East and West Indies. - Do. 1604
 Account of the Life and writings of Mrs. Trimmer. Do. 1814
 Alberti Observationes Philologicæ. - Lugd. 1725
 Allix's Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church. Lond. 1690
 Archæologia. - Do. 1770, &c.
 Asiatic Researches. - Do. 1806—1811
 Augustinus, De Civitate Dei. - Francof. 1661
 ——— De Hæresibus (ed. Welchman) Oxon. 1721
 Balguy's Essay on Redemption. - Winch. 1785
 Banier's Mythology, &c. of the Ancients. Lond. 1739
 Barbauld's (Mrs.) Remarks on Mr. Wakefield's Enquiry. Lond. 1792
 Barret's Enquiry into the origin of the Constellations. Dublin. 1800
 Barrington's Miscellanea Sacra. - Lond. 1770
 Batt on the Message from J. the Bapt. - Do. 1789
 Bayle's Dictionary. - Do. 1734
 Beattie's Essay on the nature of Truth. Dublin. 1773
 Beausob. and L'Enf. New Version of St. Matt. Camb. 1790
 Belsham's Calm Inquiry. - Lond. 1811
 ——— Elements of the Philosophy of the Mind. Do. 1801
 ——— Letters upon Arianism, &c. - Do. 1808
 ——— Review of Wilberforce's Treatise. Do. 1798
 Ben Mordecai's Apology by H. Taylor. - Do. 1784
 Berkeley's Works. - Do. 1784
 Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric. - Do. 1789
 Bocharti Opera Omnia. - Lugd. Batav. 1712
 Bolingbroke's Philosophical Works. - Lond. 1754
 ——— Works. - Do. 1754
 Boyle Lectures. - Do. 1739
 Brissonius de Regio Pers. Principatu. - Argent. 1710
 Broughton's Dictionary of all Religions. Lond. 1742
 Bruckeri Hist. Crit. Philos. - Lips. 1766
 Bryant's Observations relating to Ancient Hist. Camb. 1767
 ——— Philo Judæus. - Do. 1797
 Buchanan's Memoir on an Ecclesiastical Establishment in India. - Lond. 1805
 ——— Christian Researches in Asia, - Camb. 1811
 Burgh's Inquiry. - York. 1788

- Burnet's Life of Bedel. - - - Lond. 1685
 Butler's Analogy of Religion, &c. - - - Do. 1798
 Buxtorfii Dissertationes Philol. Theolog. - - - Basil. 1662
 ———— Synagoga Judaica. - - - Do. 1680
 Cæsar. Opera. - - - - - Lond. 1712
 Calixti Scholæ Prophetiæ, ab Ernesto. - - - Quedlinb. 1713
 Campbell's Four Gospels, &c. - - - - - Aberd. 1833
 Carpenter (Dr. Lant) Unitarianism the Doctrine of
 the Gospel, (2d ed.) - - - - - Lond. 1811
 Capelli Critica Sacra. - - - - - Paris. 1650
 Chapellow's Commentary on Job. - - - - - Camb. 1752
 Cicero. - - - - - Parisiis. 1684
 Clarke's Works. - - - - - Lond. 1738
 ———— Paraphrase, &c. (ed. 3.) - - - - - Do. 1717
 Clavigero's History of Mexico. - - - - - Do. 1737
 Clemens Romanus (Wotton) - - - - - Cant. 1718
 Cloppenburg. Sacrif. Patriarch. Schola. - - - - - Lugd. 1637
 Costard's Two Dissert. on Kesitah and Hermes. - - - - - Oxf. 1750
 Coventry's Philemon to Hydaspes. - - - - - Lond. 1753
 Crellius—Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum. - - - - - Irenop. 1656
 Cudworth's Intellectual System. - - - - - Lond. 1743
 ———— Treatise concerning Eternal and Immu-
 table Morality. - - - - - Do. 1731
 Cumberland's Sanchoniatho. - - - - - Do. 1720
 Cyrill. Alexand. contra Julian. - - - - - Lips. 1696
 Dathii Opuscula. - - - - - Do. 1796
 Dawson's Doctrine of Ph. Necessity invalidated. - - - - - Lond. 1803
 De Dieu (Ludov.) Animadversiones in Vet. Test. - - - - - Lugd. Bat. 1648
 Delancy's Rev. examined with candour. - - - - - Dublin. 1732
 De Rossi Variæ Lect. Vet. Test. - - - - - Parmæ. 1784
 D'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale. - - - - - Maestr. 1776
 Dodson's New Translation of Isaiah. - - - - - Lond. 1790
 ———— Letter to Dr. Sturges. - - - - - Do. 1791
 Edward's Survey of the Methods of Religion. - - - - - Do. 1699
 Ellis's Knowledge of Divine Things, &c. - - - - - Do. 1743
 Elrington's Donnellan Lecture Sermons. - - - - - Dub. 1796
 Elsner. Observationes Sacræ. - - - - - Traj. ad Rhen. 1720
 Ennius. - - - - - ed. Hess. 1707
 Episcopii Opera Theologica. - - - - - Lond. 1678
 Ernesti Institutio Interpr. N. T. - - - - - Lips. 1792
 Erskine's Sketches and Hints of Church History. - - - - - Edinb. 1790
 Estlin's (Dr.) Unitarian Christian's Defence. - - - - - Bristol. 1815
 Eusebii Demonstratio Evangelica. - - - - - Colon. 1688
 ———— Præparatio Evangelica. - - - - - Do. 1688
 Evanson's Dissonance of the Evangelists. - - - - - Ipswich. 1792

- Exposure of the Unwarrantable Liberties taken by Unitarians, &c. - - - Glasgow. 1813
- Fabricii Biblioth. Græc. - - - Hamb. 1705
- Biblioth. Latin. - - - Do. 1708
- Delectus Argumentorum, &c. - - - Do. 1725
- Lux Evangelii. - - - Do. 1731
- Farmer's Enquiry into the Temptation. - - - Lond. 1761
- Fellowes's Guide to Immortality. - - - Do. 1804
- Picture of Christian Philosophy. - - - Do. 1803
- Religion without Cant. - - - Do. 1808
- Fortuita Sacra. - - - Rotterod. 1726
- Gataker de Novi Instrumenti Stylo. - - - Lond. 1648
- Geddes's Critical Remarks. - - - Do. 1800
- Gillies's Aristotle's Ethics and Politics. - - - Do. 1804
- Gisbornes's Principles of Moral Philosophy. - - - Do. 1790
- Glassii Philologia Sacra. - - - a Dathio. Lips. 1776
- Goguet's Origin of Laws, &c. - - - Edin. 1775
- Graves's Lectures on the four last books of the Pentateuch. - - - Dublin. 1807
- Gray's Key to the Old Testament. - - - Dublin. 1792
- Griesbachii Nov. Test. - - - Lond. 1809
- Gregory's Lowth's Lectures. - - - Do. 1787
- Grey, Liber Jobi, a schult. - - - Do. 1742
- Grotii Opera. - - - Basil. 1732
- Gussetii Comment. Linguae Ebraicæ. - - - Amstel. 1702
- Hales's Methodism Inspected. - - - Dublin. 1803 and 1805
- Halhed's Code of Gentoo Laws. - - - Lond. 1776
- Hallet's Notes and Discourses. - - - Do. 1729
- Harris's Comment. on the 53d ch. of Isaiah. - - - Lond. 1735
- Harris's Hermes. - - - Dublin. 1773
- Haynes's (Hopton) Scripture Account, &c. ed. 4. - - - Hackney. 1815
- Heath's Essay towards a Version of Job. - - - Lond. 1756
- Heidegger. Hist. Patriarch. Sacr. - - - Amstel. 1667
- Heliodori Æthiopica. - - - Francof. 1631
- Hey's Lectures in Divinity. - - - Cambr. 1796
- Hobbes's Leviathan. - - - Lond. 1651
- Hodge's Elihu. - - - Dublin. 1757
- Hodii de Versionibus Græcis, &c. - - - Oxon. 1705
- Holmes's Four Tracts. - - - Oxford. 1788
- Horseley's Hosea. - - - Lond. 1804
- Hottingeri Smegma Orientale. - - - Heidelb. 1658
- Howes's Critical Observations—(No. 1.) - - - Lond. 1776
- N. B. The remaining numbers of the 4 volumes published at intervals through a period of about 14 years.
- Huetii Demonstratio Evangelica. - - - Francof. 1722

- Hume's Dialogues concerning Natural Religion. Lond. 1779
 ——— Essays and Treatises. - - - Dub. 1779
 ——— History of England. - - - Montrose. 1796
 Hyde. *Historia Relig. Veterum Persarum.* Oxon. 1760
 Jablonski *Pantheon Egypt.* - - - Francof. 1750
 Jennings's Jewish Antiquities. - - - Lond. 1266
 Jones, (Jerem.) on the Canon of the N. T. - Do. 1726
 Jornandes De Reb. Getic. Cassiodori Opera. Aurel. 1622
 Jortin's Remarks on Eccles. History. - Lond. 1773
 Josephus, Opera. - - - ed. Hudson. Oxon. 1720
 ——— translated by L'Estrange. - Lond. 1702
 Ittigius de Hæresiarchis. - - - Lipsiæ. 1690
 Juliani Opera, Cyrill. - - - Lips. 1696
 Justini Martyris Apolog. Duæ. - - - Lond. 1722
 Kennicot's Remarks on Select Passages. - Oxf. 1737
 ——— State of the Hebrew Text. - - - Do. 1753
 ——— Two Dissertations. - - - Do. 1747
 Kidder's Commentary on the 5 books of Moses. Lond. 1694
 Koecheri *Analecta.* - - - Altenburg. 1766
 Krebsii *Observationes e Flav. Josepho.* - Lips. 1575
 Laplace. *Exposition du Système du Monde.* Paris. 1798
 ——— *Traité de Mécanique Céleste.* - - - Do. 1798
 Lardner's Works, by Kippis. - - - Lond. 1788
 Lavoisier's Elements of Chemistry. - - - Edinb. 1793
 Laurence, (Dr.) on the Logos. - - - Oxf. 1808
 ——— Critical Reflections on the Unit.
 Vers. of the N. T. - - - Do. 1811
 ——— Remarks upon the Systematic Clas-
 sification of Griesbach. - - - Do. 1814
 Law's Theory of Religion. - - - Camb. 1774
 Layman's Letters to Mr. Wilberforce. - - - Lond. 1799
 Le Clerc, Nov. Test. - - - Francof. 1714
 Leland's Christian Revelation. - - - Do. 1764
 Less on the Authenticity of the N. T. (Kingdon.) Lond. 1804
 Leslie's Theological Works. - - - Francof. 1721
 Letters from a late Eminent Prelate. - - - Do. 1809
 Lightfoot's Works. - - - Do. 1684
 Lindsey's Apology. - - - Dublin. 1775
 ——— Sequel to Apology. - - - Lond. 1776
 Lloyd's Christian Theology. - - - Do. 1804
 Loccenii *Antiq. Sueo. Goth.* - - - Holm. 1647
 ——— *Historia Rerum Suecic.* - - - Francof. 1676
 Locke's Works. - - - Lond. 1768
 Loesneri *Observ. ad N. T. e Phil. Alex.* - Lipsiæ. 1777
 London (Bishop of) Charge - - - Lond. 1815
 Lowth. *De Sacra Poesi Hebr.* - - - Oxon. 1753

Lowth. Letter to Warburton.	-	-	Lond. 1766
———— Translation of Isaiah.	-	-	Perth. 1793
Maimonides De Cultu Divino.	-	-	Parisiis. 1671
———— Moreh Nevochim, Buxtorf.	-	-	Basil. 1629
———— De Pœnitentiâ. Clavering.	-	-	Oxon. 1705
———— De Sacrificiis. De Viel.	-	-	Lond. 1683
Mallet's Northern Antiquities.	-	-	Do. 1770
Maltby's Illustrations of the Christ. Religion.	-	-	Cambr. 1803
Marsh's Course of Lectures, parts i. ii. iii.	-	-	Do. 1809
			1810, 1813
Marshami Canon Chronicus.	-	-	Franeq. 1696
Martinii Sinic. Hist.	-	-	Amstel. 1659
Mason's Works of Gray.	-	-	Lond. 1807
Maurice's Indian Antiquities.	-	-	Do. 1794
Mede's Works.	-	-	Do. 1672
Memoirs of Lord Bolingbroke.	-	-	Do. 1752
Meuschen. Nov. Testam. ex Talmude.	-	-	Lips. 1736
Michælis (J. D.) Grammatica Syriaca.	-	-	Halæ. 1784
———— Introduction to the N. T. (Marsh. ed.)	-	-	Camb. 1793
———— Notæ et Epimetra	-	-	Oxon. 1763
Mickle's (Camoëns) Lusiad.	-	-	Dublin. 1791
Middleton's Doctrine of the Greek Article.	-	-	Lond. 1808
Millii Nov. Test. (ed. Kuster.)	-	-	Roterod. 1710
Mirabaub. Systeme de la Nature.	-	-	Lond. 1781
Montucla. Histoire des Mathematiques.	-	-	Paris. 1758
More's (Hannah) Cœlebs.	-	-	Lond. 1809
———— Hints for a young princess.	-	-	Do. 1805
———— (Hannah) Works.	-	-	Dublin. 1803
Morgan's Moral Philosopher.	-	-	Lond. 1737
Morini Exercit. De Linguâ Primævâ.	-	-	Ultraject. 1694
Mosheim's Eccles. History.	-	-	Lond. 1765
Nares's Bampton Lecture Sermons.	-	-	Oxf. 1795
———— Remarks on the Version of the N. T. by the Unitarians.	-	-	Lond. 1810
		(ed. 2.)	Do. 1814
Newcome's (A. Bish.) Historical view of the Eng- lish Biblical Translations.	-	-	Dublin. 1792
Newton's Chronology.	-	-	Lond. 1728
Nichols's Conference with a Theist.	-	-	Do. 1723
Noldii Concordantiæ Partic. Ebr.	-	-	Ienæ. 1734
Nott's Bampton Lecture.	-	-	Oxf. 1803
Orford's (Lord) Works.	-	-	Lond. 1798
Origen against Celsus (by Bellamy.)	-	-	Do.
Orme's History of Indostan.	-	-	Do. 1803
Outram De Sacrificiis.	-	-	Amstel. 1688
Owen on the Hebrews (abridged by Williams.)	-	-	Lond. 1790

- Owen's Modes of Quotation. - - - Lond. 1789
 Palairot. Observat. Philologico. Criticæ. - Lugd. 1752
 Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy. - Dublin. 1793
 Parr's Spital Sermon. - - - - Lond. 1804
 Patrum Apostolic. Opera, cura Ric. Russell. - Do. 1746
 Pauw Recherch. Philos. sur les Americ. - Berl. 1768
 Pearce's (Bishop) Comm. and other Writings. Lond. 1777
 Pearson on the Creed. - - - - Do. 1715
 ——— Vindiciæ Epist. S. Ignat. - - - Cantab. 1673
 ——— Critical Essay on the 9th book of the Div.
 Leg. - - - - - Camb. 1808
 Peirce's Paraphrase. - - - - Lond. 1733
 Percival's Father's Instructions, part 3d. - Do. 1800
 Peters's Critical Dissert. on Job. - - - Do. 1754
 Pfochenii Diatribe de Ling. Græc. N. T. - Amstel. 1633
 Phavorini Lexicon. - - - - Basil. 1538
 Philonis Opera. - - - - Parisiis. 1640
 Photii Bibliotheca. - - - - Rothom. 1653
 Pilkington's Remarks, &c. - - - Camb. 1759
 Platonis Opera. - - - - Francof. 1602
 Plauti Opera, (Lambini.) - - - - Paris. 1577
 Plutarchi Opera. - - - - Francof. 1620
 Pocock's Theological Works. - - - Lond. 1740
 Porphyrius de Abstinentiâ. - - - Lugd. 1623
 Powell's Discourses on various subjects. - Lond. 1776
 Pretzman's Elements of Christ. Theology. - - Do. 1800
 Price's Four Dissertations. - - - Do. 1768
 ——— Review of Morals. - - - - Do. 1769
 Priestley's History of Corruptions, &c. - Birming. 1782
 ——— Notes on Scripture. - - - Northumb. 1803
 ——— Tracts in controuv. with B. Horsley, (Bel-
 sham.) - - - - Lond. 1815
 Protestant Apology for the R. C. Church. - Dublin. 1809
 Randolph's Sermons in Advent. - - - Lond. 1801
 ——— Book of Job translated by Miss Smith. Bath. 1810
 Raphelii, (G.) Annot. in Sacr. Scrip. - Lugd. Batav. 1747
 Reid's Essays on the Intellect. Powers. - Dublin. 1786
 Remarks on Hume's Essay on the Nat. Hist. of Reli-
 gion. - - - - Do. 1777
 Rennel's Discourses on various subjects. - - Do. 1801
 Richardson's Dissert. on the Language of Eastern Na-
 tions. - - - - Oxf. 1770
 Richie's Criticism on modern notions of Sacrifice. Lond. 1761
 ——— Peculiar Doct. of Revelation. - Warringt. 1766
 Rosenmuller, (J. G.) Scholia in N. T. Norimberg. 1792, &c.
 Sale's Koran. - - - - Bath. 1795

- Schnurrer. Dissert. Philolog. Criticæ. - Gothæ. 1790
 Scholar Armed. - - - - - Lond. 1795
 Schultens. Liber Jobi. - - - - - Ludg. Batav. 1737
 ——— Origines Hebrææ. - - - - - Francof. 1724
 Scripture Account of Sacrifices (Portal.) - - - Lond. 1755
 Semleri Apparatus ad liberal. N. T. Interpret.
 Halæ. Magdeb. 1767
 Senecæ Opera. - - - - - Amstel. 1672
 Shaw's Travels in Barbary and the Levant. - - Oxf. 1738
 Sherlock's Use of Prophecy. - - - - - Lond. 1749
 Shuckford's Connexion of Sacr. and Prof. History. Lond. 1743
 Simon. Critique de la Biblioth. et Des Proleg. de Dupin.
 Paris. 1790
 ——— Critical History of the O. T. - - - - - Lond. 1682
 Simpson's (Rev. David) Plea for the Deity of Jesus. Do. 1812
 Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments. - - - - - Do. 1759
 Socini Opera. (Biblioth. Fratr. Polon.) - - - - - Irenop. 1656
 Socinianism Unmasked. - - - - - Lond. 1815
 Spanhemii Historia Jobi. - - - - - Lugd. 1672
 Speerman's Letters on the Septuagint. - - - - - Edinb. 1759
 Spencer De Legibus Hebr. - - - - - Cantab. 1727
 ——— Discourse on Prodigies. - - - - - Lond. 1665
 Stebbing's Examination of Warburton. - - - - - Do. 1747
 Stewart's (Dugald) Elem. of the Philos. of the Hu-
 man Mind. - - - - - Do. 1792
 Stillingfleet's Origines Sacræ. - - - - - Do. 1724
 Sermons on Several Occasions. - - - - - Do. 1673
 St. David's (Bishop of) Brief Memorial. - - - Durham. 1814
 ——— the Bible and nothing but the Bible. Carmarth. 1815
 Stock's Isaiah. - - - - - Bath. 1803
 ——— Job. - - - - - Do. 1805
 Strabo. - - - - - Amstel. 1707
 Stuart's View of Society in Europe. - - - - - Lond. 1782
 Suiceri Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus. - - - - - Amstel. 1682
 Suidæ Historica. - - - - - Basil. 1564
 Sykes Essay on Sacrifices. - - - - - Lond. 1748
 ——— Essay on the Truth of the Christ. Relig. Do. 1725
 Sykes's Scripture Doctrine of Redemption. Lond. 1756
 Taciti Opera. ed. Brotier. - - - - - Paris. 1771
 Theological Repository—vol. 1, 2, 3. - - - - - Lond. 1795
 ——— vols. 4, 5, 6. Birm. 1784, 1786, 1788
 Thesaurus Temp. Jos. Scalig. Animadv. - - - - - Amstel. 1658
 Tindal's Christ. as Old as the Creation. - - - - - Lond. 1732
 Tillotson's Works. - - - - - Do. 1728
 Townson's Discourses on the Gospels. - - - - - Oxf. 1788
 Van Mildert's Boyle Lecture Sermons. - - - - - Lond. 1806

- [Unitarian] Version of the New Testament. - Do. 1808
 Universal History, (Ancient) - - - Dublin. 1745
 Velthusen, &c. Comment. Theologicæ. Lips. 1794—1798
 Venema Opuscula Inedita. - - - Leovardiae. 1778
 Veysie's Bampton Lecture. - - - Oxf. 1795
 ——— Defence of the Preservative. - Exeter. 1810
 Villier's Essay on the Reformation (Mills) - Lond. 1803
 Vitringæ Comment. in Jesaiam. - - - Leov. 1714
 Volney's Ruins. - - - Lond. 1795
 Vorstius de Hebraisimis, N. T. - - Amstelod. 1665
 Vossius (Ger. J.) de Theolog. Gentil. et Idololat. Francof. 1668
 ——— Disputatio Gemina. - Amstelod. 1643
 Wakefield's Inquiry into the opinions of the three first
 Centuries. - - - Lond. 1784
 ——— Translation of the New Test. - - Do. 1795
 Warburton's Divine Legation. - - - Do. 1738
 ——— Principles of Natural and Rev. Relig. Do. 1753
 Wardlaw's Discourses on the Socinian Controversy, Glas. 1814
 Walker's Letter to Belsham. - - - Dublin. 1799
 Ward's Errata of the Prot. Bible. - - - Do. 1807
 Watson's (B. of Landaff) Two Apologies, &c. Lond. 1806
 Wesley. Dissertationes in Librum Jobi. - - Do. 1736
 Wesley's (John) Sunday Service of the Methodists. Do. 1790
 Whitaker's Origin of Arianism. - - - Do. 1791
 White's Commentary on Isaiah. - - - Lond. 1709
 Wilberforce's Practical View. - - - Do. 1797
 Williams's Free Enquiry into the 1st and 2d chapters
 St. Matthew. - - - Do. 1789
 Wilson's Illustration of the Method of explaining the
 New Testament. - - - Camb. 1797
 Winder's History of Knowledge. - - - Lond. 1745
 Windet De vita functorum statu. - - - Do. 1677
 Witsii Egyptiaca. - - - Herb. Nassav. 1717
 ——— Miscellanea Sacra. - - - Do. 1712
 Wolfii Curæ Philolog. - - - Hamb. 1733
 Wollaston's Religions of Nature. - - - Lond. 1725
 Young's Centaur not Fabulous. - - - Dublin. 1755







Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01008 5555